A 5c 77

UCSB LIBRARY
X-58058

MEMOIR

OF THE

Rev. WALTER BALFOUR,

AUTHOR OF LETTERS TO PROF. STUART,

AND VARIOUS OTHER PUBLICATIONS.

By THOMAS WHITTEMORE.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY J. M. USHER,
No. 37 Cornhill,
1852.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1852, by
JAMES M. USHER,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

PREFACE.

I have been induced to prepare the Memoir of Rev. Walter Balfour, by the solicitations of several of my ministering brethren. I had known him, ever after his arrival in this country. He took up his residence amid the scenes of my youth; and it was permitted me to see every step of his progress.

The predominant moral qualities of Mr. Balfour were honesty, love of Scripture truth, a fearless spirit of inquiry, and independence to assert and defend what he believed. His knowledge of the Scriptures was extensive; and the works he produced, although not all regarded by the writer as faultless, were very valuable, and have

exerted, and will continue to exert, a wide influence on the community. Such men as Walter Balfour continue to live on the earth after they are dead. It was said of Abel, "being dead, yet he speaketh," Heb. xi. 4. So we may say of the subject of this memoir. The influence of his life will be long felt. The truth that radiated from him will be reflected from mind to mind; and many perhaps will be enlightened by it, who may not be conscious of ever having heard his name. To assist in giving the proper influence to his life and character, the following work has been prepared. May the divine blessing attend it.

T. W.

MEMOIR

OF

REV. WALTER BALFOUR.

The name Balfour has been a name of some eminence in Scotland. The family of Balfour, long heritable sheriffs of Fife, derive their name from Balfour Castle in that county, built upon their earliest possessions in the vale or strath of the river Or, a tributary of the river Leven. Their first recorded ancestor was Siward, probably a Northumbrian, living in the reign of Duncan I. His grandson, Octred, witnessed a charter of David 1. about 1151–2. Sir James Balfour was deputy Governor of the castle of Edinburg, in the time of Mary, Queen of Scots; and when that castle was besieged by the associated lords, he delivered up the jewels and the private correspondence of the queen, to

The name Balfour.

the messenger sent to receive them. A person of the name of Balfour was lieutenant of the Tower of London, during the reign of Charles I. The famous Earl of Strafford, who was a prisoner there, under sentence of death for high treason," offered Lieut. B. £22,000, the king's warrant of indemnity, and other gifts, for his escape, which was refused. We have not the means of tracing the pedigree of the subject of this memoir.

Birth and Youth of Walter Balfour

He was born at St. Ninians, not far from the year 1776. This is one of the small towns of Scotland, and is situated in Stirlingshire, a few miles south of Stirling, about forty miles north west of Edinburg, and nearly as far N. E. of Glasgow. Here he passed the term of his youth. He was fully initiated into the religious creed of the Church of *Scotland* during his childhood and youth; and early received strong religious impressions under the preaching of Rev. William Sheriff, then Minister of St. Ninians. From his earliest years young Balfour had a strong love for reading. From this source of information, and from a habitual perusal of the Scriptures, he was led to doubt the correctness of some of his religious impressions and opinions. He always was an

honest inquirer after truth. He felt the impulse of this generous attribute of his nature, very early in life. His doubts related to the general aspect of the Church of Scotland, as established by law—her government—rather than the doctrines of her creed. He was in no small degree weaned from his mother church, by reading some of the ablest works on church government. Besides, a weekly meeting was held in the village —by a select number of about twelve or fifteen— for prayer and conversation on the Scriptures. Each member took his turn in prayer, and made such remarks on the portion of Scripture read as seemed correct and pertinent. One of Mr. Sheriff's deacons was of this number, and Mr. S. himself frequently attended.

Is admitted a member of Mr. Haldane's School.

While these things were gradually infusing a little light into the mind of young Balfour, Mr. Robert Haldane—a rich gentleman in the neighborhood—determined to devote a large share of his fortune in diffusing a knowledge of the Gospel in Scotland and other places. To accomplish this benevolent design, he selected twenty-five persons with a view to educate them for the ministry. The deacon, referred to above, and Mr. Balfour made two of this number. Some of our readers may have

some knowledge of the thorough course of theological education pursued in Mr. Haldane's school, and of this gentleman's exertions to spread the Gospel in Scotland, on the continent, and in other places. It was in this school that Mr. Balfour was prepared for the studies which he pursued in after life. He paid particular attention to Hebrew and Greek, as being the languages in which the Sacred Scriptures were originally written. He foresaw not the consequences to which this preparation would ultimately lead him. He had strong confidence in the doctrines which he then professed; he believed them with all his heart; it was his desire to consecrate his life to the promulgation of them. The more he might learn of Sacred Literature, the more firmly, as he supposed, should he cherish those doctrines, and the more capable should he be of maintaining them. He therefore gave himself to his studies with unabating ardor; resolving to prepare himself for the accomplishment of the greatest good of which he was capable.

Becomes a preacher in Scotland.

After pursuing the course of studies described, Mr. Balfour commenced to preach, in his native country. This occupation he pursued for a few years, before he resolved to emigrate to America. He had several invita-

tions to settle as a pastor, but these he declined, believing he could make himself more useful as an itinerant or missionary. We do not wonder at all at his resolution. The pastor's life was not suited to his taste. He did not love restriction nor confinement. He had a strong sense of individuality. He had not a desire to be restrained to a small Parish. His spirit was peculiarly a missionary spirit. If it involved the sacrifice of ease, and of the comforts of home, more than a pastor's life, he was ready to make it. If a missionary, he should be free. He could preach without the slightest restraint, what he esteemed to be the doctrines of the word of God; and if the people refused to hear, he could shake the dust from his feet, and go and preach to others. He was in early life, a great reader of the Scriptures. All the history of the sacred books, all the devotional parts, all the prophecies, the life and sufferings of Christ, the labors, travels, sacrifices and sufferings of the apostles, were all vivid and familiar scenes hung up in the chambers of his memory. Nothing would have been more natural to him, than the desire to imitate the apostles, not only in the doctrines they preached, but also in the manner of their lives. The missionary spirit, therefore, burned within him.

Resolves to emigrate to America.

From reading he had conceived a strong predilection for America, which was in no degree diminished by his further advance in life, and progress in knowledge. Being fixed in his purpose to cross the ocean and settle in the new world, he sought to avail himself of certain advantages which he could find in his native land, but which would not be so easily attainable in America. We refer to his attendance on the course of theological lectures in Edinburg. He accordingly resided a year in that city, and attended the lectures of the University. And it was there that he became acquainted with a young American by the name of Codman, afterwards settled as the pastor of a congregation at Dorchester, Mass. They became mutually attached; and sailed together from Leith to London. Mr. Balfour did not remain long, however, in the great metropolis of the British empire; but sailed for Halifax, Nova Scotia, A. D. 1806. Here he tarried but a short time; it was not to be the place of his labors. After spending the winter in the province, he came to the United States. He probably had letters of introduction to Dr. Jedediah Morse, of Charlestown, who was, at the time of Mr. Balfour's arrival, one of the most eminent of the orthodox clergy of New England.

Mr. Balfour's mind was active. As we have already intimated, he was stimulated by his ardent love of truth, to seek continually for it. That he was strongly attached to his opinions, we do not deny; but he reverenced them, not because they were his opinions,—not from any feelings of self-importance; but because he believed them to be founded in truth. While he was decided in the statement of his opinions, and was wedded to them, for the reasons we have stated,—his mind was open to every new ray of light. His sentiment was, "Prove all things, and hold fast that which is good." He prayed, with the poet,

Did not remain with his first associates,

> "If I am right, thy grace impart,
> Still in the right to stay;
> If I am wrong, O teach my heart,
> To find the better way."

Few persons will be able to estimate how strongly such feelings swayed Mr. Balfour. He would not, if he knew it, harbor an error in his mind, any more than he would sin in his heart. It could not be possible that such a man would remain, for any length of time, trammelled by a creed. We are to expect, that he will not remain long in intimate connexion with his first American associates. Let it not be thought that he

was a man of fluctuating mind; far from it. He had not the element of change. Having adopted his opinions in honesty, he supposed them correct; and his honesty and natural inflexibility would have made him invulnerable to change, had it not been that he bowed, with a deep reverence, before the majesty of truth. He was determined to follow the light of truth wherever it led him. He would sacrifice nothing to his creed, as such; but all to conscience. Now what could be expected of such a man? Would he conform to others for mere benevolence? for the sake of a welcome at their fire-sides or their tables? Indeed, he would not. He would give them the last dollar to aid them in relieving the distresses of mankind; but he would adopt no new doctrine, or continue to support an old one, for the sake of all the smiles and favors that men might see fit to bestow upon him.

Takes up his abode in Charlestown,

Mr. Balfour, as we have said, came into the country with letters of introduction to Dr. Morse, of Charlestown, written perhaps by Mr. Codman, with whom he had sailed from Leith to London. He was received with much cordiality by the Doctor. That eminent divine exercised a great influence in New England. He was, in fact, the leader of

the orthodox party, who were then beginning to draw off from associates, whom they suspected of Unitarianism. He was a man of great blandness; dignified; of considerable learning; a very good writer; but he did not shine in the pulpit, except when he sung. His voice was a beautiful alto; and when he joined in the musical part of the exercises, as he usually did, if acquainted with the tune, he attracted the attention of all. He loved to have help in the public services from any competent brother who might come along. In those days the members of the church used to hold vestry meetings, in the neat little chapel, that stood in the parish garden, on the southern slope of the town hill. The Doctor, who was not used to extempore speaking, was always happy to receive any ministering brother, who had the talent to make these meetings interesting. Mr. Balfour, especially when a young man, excelled in that respect. He had been a diligent student of the Scriptures, and had always practiced preaching without notes. When he entered the Doctor's pulpit, therefore, and especially in the conference meeting, he excited great attention. He became acquainted, at once, without putting himself forward in the least, with all the principal members of the Doctor's church and

congregation. He was spoken of as a man of great learning, who had the Scriptures almost wholly committed to memory, and who had the power to preach, without writing his sermons, and apparently without taking thought what he should say, as it seemed to be given him in that very hour. It was thought that God had brought him to this country, for a great purpose, and that he would be instrumental in the accomplishment of a high degree of good. He visited the first families in the town; and took up his abode for the time in that of deacon Warren, a worthy and respected citizen. But his labors were not confined to Charlestown. He was invited to the pulpits of the orthodox clergymen, through all the surrounding region. He preached without compensation, except such as was bestowed by the free will of the people; for he had serious doubts, at this time, whether it was proper and right for a minister of the gospel, to receive a stipulated price for his labors. He abhorred every thing that partook of the nature of a *bargain* in respect to the preaching of the gospel; and he trusted that the Lord would provide for him.

His marriage. In the course of his visits among the members of the Doctor's church, he became

acquainted with the amiable lady, who was soon to be united to him in marriage. This was Miss Mary Devens, a grand daughter of the well known Commissary Devens, (as he was universally called,) one of the most wealthy and respected citizens of the town in his day. Mr. Balfour was a welcome visiter at the house of that amiable and good man, deacon Thomas Miller, who had married the mother of Miss Devens. His acquaintance with Miss Devens soon ripened into that mutual respect and love, which ever afterwards made their union happy. They were united in marriage, by the Rev. William Collier, the Baptist clergyman of Charlestown, on Dec. 4th, 1809. Mr. Collier was a man universally respected for his benevolence, integrity and piety, although his pulpit talents were not of a high order. Whether he was chosen to officiate at the marriage of Mr. Balfour because Dr. Morse was at the time absent from town, the writer has not troubled himself to inquire. Perhaps, thus early, the Doctor had discovered that Mr. Balfour was no suple instrument to be used for other men's benefit; but that he had an independent mind; an honest conscience, that was true to the convictions of his own understanding; and that he was not to be fettered by any forms of faith

drawn up by other men. The family with which Mr. Balfour had thus connected himself, was one of the most respectable families in the town. She survives him. Her relatives, persons of high discernment and respectability, entertain a profound respect for his memory. He corresponded to their ideas of a truly good and honest man.

His habits of inquiry displease the Calvinists.

But let us return to the early life of Mr. Balfour in Charlestown. We have already intimated, that a person of his honesty and independence, and unceasing spirit of inquiry, could not remain fettered by any creed. What he believed he avowed; and although he continued to hold, without any doubt, the doctrine of the endless misery of the wicked; although the suspicion had never once crossed his mind that the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all men might be true, yet there were points on which he differed from Dr. Morse and the majority of his church. This state of things broke up the intimacy that had existed between them; and Mr. Balfour could no longer be admitted into the Doctor's pulpit. Such was the Doctor's influence and wide acquaintance with the orthodox clergy of the vicinity, that the feelings cherished by him would soon become general, and Mr. Balfour, having a spirit that

would disdain to plead or sue for any favors, would follow what he regarded as the path of duty, even if it cost him the regard of those who had professed to be his dearest friends. Although he went no more into the pulpit of Dr. Morse, yet still he had friends,—christians,—who were ready to follow him, and bear reproach and opposition, if need be, for conscience sake. A hall was obtained and these friends clustered around him. They held meetings regularly upon the Sabbath day, for years. He preached without pecuniary compensation, supporting himself by opening a store, for a very respectable branch of mercantile business upon the main street in Charlestown. But he never for a day abandoned his theological studies. Books were his companions. At his place of business, when no one was present, he was almost invariably engaged in reading or writing; and at home, especially in the long winter evenings, he maintained the same habits. He never for an hour, lost his interest in the great subject of moral and religious truth. He was a constant inquirer, albeit at the same time he was a teacher. What he had learned, he was willing to teach others, but he felt that he should always be a learner himself. The fountain dispenses streams to fertilize the

surrounding region; but this it would not do except its own bosom were filled by the rains from heaven.

Is baptized, In the course of his inquiries, Mr. Balfour had his attention turned to the subject of adult baptism, and to the proper form thereof. He reflected deeply upon this subject, and sought to learn what were the opinions and what was the practice of the disciples of Christ, in the apostolic day, touching this matter. The result in his own mind was, that he believed baptism by immersion to be the proper form. He conferred not with flesh and blood; but proposed himself, as a candidate for baptism to Rev. William Collier, of whom we have before spoken; and upon a beautiful Sabbath morning, he was immersed in the arm of the sea that bathes the base of the gentle declivity, where the ancient dead of the town were laid. His views on the subject of baptism were never afterwards changed. In fact, he seldom found reason to change his mind in regard to any subject, on which his opinion had been deliberately formed. The changes of his mind affected those doctrines only into which he had been initiated in his childhood.

Preaches at Washington Hall. He is now to be contemplated for a series of ten or twelve years,

as the preacher to a small, but very respectable congregation, at Washington Hall, in Charlestown. These were principally persons living in Boston and Charlestown, who were attached to him for his piety, his sound scriptural discourses, as they regarded them, and for the honesty, integrity and noble christian independence of the man. He had no compensation, except a few slight gifts from the people; yet he faithfully labored for their good. He prepared two sermons for each Sabbath day, with the same regularity and faithfulness that he would have observed, had he been the pastor of a congregation that furnished him a living. Those who heard him were always interested. His discourses were marked with sound sense, and abounded with scriptural knowledge. In the meantime, in order to support himself, he continued the store in Charlestown, and for the principal part of the time without any one to assist him. He was salesman and clerk himself; he was proverbially honest; what he said, his customers believed; but the predominating passion with him was not a love of worldly business, but a love of theological studies. As the atmosphere was the element in which his body lived, so theological study was the element of his soul.

CHAP. II.

THE ANDOVER INSTITUTION AND PROF. STUART.

A digression. We must digress for a short time from Mr. Balfour to give a brief account of the Andover Institution and of Professor Moses Stuart.

The Andover Institution. This Institution grew up in consequence of Harvard University having passed into the hands of the Unitarians. The Unitarian influence had been secretly increasing in Massachusetts, especially in the vicinity of Boston; but no public demonstration was made in favor of the principles of that sect, until the fact was made clear, that the government of the University had become decidedly Unitarian. This point was settled by the election of Dr. Henry Ware, as Hollis Professor of Divinity. Dr. Ware was not a Calvinist. He did not make a clear definition of his faith on the points in controversy between the two great parties that were manœuvring for mastery in the University; but it was

well understood that he was a Unitarian. A late writer in one of the public papers in Charlestown, whom we do not hesitate to describe as an eminent physician there,—a native of the town,—who has made it his residence for the whole term of his life, now about seventy years,-has spoken of the rise of the Andover Institution as follows:

"It will be remembered, that the founding of Harvard College "for Christ and the Church" was among the earliest and most cherished objects of the Fathers of New England. Many now living know how and when the College passed out of the control of Orthodoxy into the hands of Unitarians—not without a severe struggle—the din of that fierce controversy is still ringing in our ears—the Charlestown folks, especially, were in the hottest of it. It is but justice to say, that the champions of Calvinism fought nobly, but the battle ended, (as all such battles always will end, either in religion or politics,) in the triumph of liberal opinions. But the discomfitted party were not men to sit down quietly under such defeat. They girded themselves with new zeal, mustered their forces of talent and wealth, (and these were great and powerful,) and planted their standard and flung it to the breeze on one of the most beautiful heights of New England. It will not for a moment be denied that the Andover Institution was begotten and born out of the controversy about Harvard College. It is bare justice to say that among all the truly distinguished men who have filled and adorned the offices of this Institution, no one has attained the high fame of Professor Stuart. The Andover Institution, expressly set up as the defence and support of Orthodoxy or Partialism, officially made Prof. Stuart, and in the wonderful providence of God, Prof. Stuart made Mr. Balfour a Universalist; and

without any disparagement of the extraordinary talent of Prof. Stuart, it is safe to say that where he has reached and influenced one human mind, Mr. Balfour has aroused thousands; because the critical labors of the learned Professor are suited only to the capacity of a few select minds, while the labors of Mr. Balfour operate directly on the mass of common minds. What shall we say then to these things? For my own part when I consider the reflex operations of Divine Providence, as manifested in all the great questions which affect humanity, I am more and more constrained to cast myself humbly down at the feet of Jesus, and to exclaim with the good Apostle, "O the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and knowledge of God; how unsearchable are his judgements and his ways past finding out—for who hath known the mind of the Lord, and who hath been his counsellor, or who hath given to him, and it shall be recompensed to him again. For of him and through him and to him are all things—to whom be glory forever. Amen!" "

The Creed of the Institution.

Such were the circumstances under which the Andover Institution was founded. Among the first cares of its founders, was the preparation of a Creed to which every person who shall accept a professorship in the Institution must give his public assent. To show how exclusively this Institution is devoted to orthodoxy, so called, and how carefully every change in this respect is sought to be prevented forever, a few extracts shall here be made from the statutes of the Institution.

"Every Professor shall be *an* orthodox and *consistent* Calvinist;" and after a careful examination by the

visitors with reference to his religious principles, he shall, on the day of inauguration, publicly make and subscribe a solemn declaration of his faith in Divine Revelation, and in the fundamental and distinguishing doctrines of the Gospel, as expressed in the following Creed, which is supported by the infallible Revelation which God constantly makes of himself in his works of creation, providence, and redemption, namely :—

CREED OF THE INSTITUTION.

"I believe that there is one and but one living and true God ; that the word of God, contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, is the only perfect rule of faith and practice ; that agreeably to those Scriptures God is a Spirit, infinite, eternal and unchangeable in his being, wisdom, power, holiness, justice, goodness and truth ; that in the Godhead are three persons, the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost ; and that these three are one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory ; that God created man after his own image in knowledge, righteousness and holiness ; that the glory of God is man's chief end, and the enjoyment of God is supreme happiness ; that this enjoyment is derived solely from conformity of heart to the moral character and will of God ; that Adam, the federal head and representative of the human race, was placed in a state of probation, and that in consequence of his disobedience all his descendants were constituted sinners ; that by nature every man is personally depraved, destitute of holiness, unlike and opposed to God, and that previously to the renewing agency of the Divine Spirit all his moral actions are adverse to the character and glory of God ; that being morally incapable of recovering the image of his Creator, which was lost in Adam, every man is justly exposed to eternal damnation ; so that, except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God ; that God, of his mere good pleasure, from all eternity,

elected some to everlasting life, and that he entered into a covenant of grace to deliver them out of this state of sin and misery, by a Redeemer; that the only Redeemer of the elect is the eternal Son of God, who for this purpose became man, and continues to be God and man in two distinct natures and one person forever; that Christ as our Redeemer executes the office of a Prophet, Priest and King; that, agreeably to the covenant of Redemption, the Son of God, and he alone, by his suffering and death, has made atonement for the sins of all men; that repentance, faith and holiness, are the personal requisites in the gospel scheme of salvation; that the righteousness of Christ is the only ground of a sinner's justification; that this righteousness is received through faith; and that this faith is the gift of God; so that our salvation is wholly of grace; that no means whatever can change the heart of a sinner, and make it holy; that regeneration and sanctification are effects of the creating and renewing agency of the Holy Spirit, and that supreme love to God constitutes the essential difference between saints and sinners; that by convincing us of our sin and misery, enlightening our minds, working faith in us, and renewing our wills, the Holy Spirit makes us partakers of the benefits of redemption; and that the ordinary means by which these benefits are communicated to us, are the word, sacrament, and prayer; that repentance unto life, faith to feed upon Christ, love to God and new obedience, are the appropriate qualifications for the Lord's Supper; and that a Christian Church ought to admit no person to its holy communion, before he exhibits credible evidence of his godly sincerity; that perseverance in holiness is the only method of making our calling and election sure; and that the final perseverance of the saints, though it is the effect of the especial operation of God on their hearts, necessarily implies their own watchful diligence; that they, who are effectually called, do in

this life partake of justification, adoption and sanctification, and the several benefits which do either accompany or flow from them; that the souls of believers are at their death made perfect in holiness, and do immediately pass into glory; that their bodies being still united to Christ, will at the resurrection be raised up to glory, and that the saints will be made perfectly blessed in the full enjoyment of God to all eternity; but that the wicked will awake to shame and everlasting contempt, and with devils be plunged into the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone forever and ever. I moreover believe that God, according to the counsel of his own will, and for his own glory, hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass, and that all beings, actions and events, both in the natural and moral world, are under his providential direction; that God's decrees perfectly consist with human liberty; God's universal agency with the agency of man, and man's dependence with his accountability; that man has understanding and corporeal strength to do all that God requires of him; so that nothing but the sinner's aversion to holiness prevents his salvation; that it is the prerogative of God to bring good out of evil, and that he will cause the wrath and rage of wicked men and devils to praise him; and that all the evil which has existed and which will forever exist in the moral system will eventually be made to promote a most important purpose under the wise and perfect administration of that Almighty Being; who will cause all things to work for his own glory, and thus fulfil all his pleasure. And furthermore I do solemnly promise that I will open and explain the Scriptures to my pupils with integrity and faithfulness; that I will maintain and inculcate the Christian Faith, as expressed in the Creed, by me now repeated, together with all the other doctrines and duties of our holy religion, so far as may appertain to my office, according to the best light God shall give me, and in opposition not only to Atheists

and Infidels, but to Jews, Papists, Mahometans, Arians, Socinians, Sabellians, Unitarians and Universalists, and to all heresies and errors, ancient or modern, which may be opposed to the Gospel of Christ, or hazardous to the souls of men; that by my instruction, counsel and example, I will endeavor to promote true piety and godliness; that I will consult the good of this Institution, and the peace of the Churches of our Lord Jesus Christ on all occasions—and that I will religiously conform to the Constitution and Laws of this Seminary, and to the Statutes of this Foundation."

"The preceding Creed and Declaration shall be repeated by every Professor on this Foundation at the expiration of every successive period of five years, and no man shall be continued a Professor on said Foundation, who shall not continue to approve himself a man of sound and orthodox principles in divinity according to the aforesaid Creed."

The Creed bars out free inquiry.

Such is the creed which the Professors at Andover must subscribe at their inauguration, and which, every fifth year, they must repeat as the declaration of their faith.

One cannot help remarking here, that free inquiry is forever barred out of the Institution. No Professor can dissent the least from the foregoing creed, without forfeiting his office and all its emoluments. He must therefore henceforth sit down quietly under the impression that he *cannot be wrong*, or else expose himself to the danger already described. What temptations then are placed before the Professors, not to make

them desirous to discover *what is truth*, but to suppress every rising inquiry, to maintain a blind devotion to a creed framed by men, all of whom, in a few years, will have passed away. Is it not a matter of astonishment that the Professors would receive their offices on such conditions? The creed virtually binds them to study the Bible with a fixed determination to believe what they now profess, and nothing opposed to it. Setting all the future at defiance, it bids them close their eyes upon every ray of increasing light, and upon the labors of every ardent lover of truth, who shall henceforth rise up, so far as he shall depart from the creed. What is this less than saying, *we know we are right*? and what more did the Pope at Rome ever say? Protestants have ridiculed the Pope because he lays claim to infallibility; wherein does this differ? If those who framed this creed, and those who have signed it, admitted of a *possibility* of their being wrong, it was arrogant presumption, it was direct hostility to truth in them to place it upon the foundation on which it stands, and in the most solemn manner to bind every Professor and every Visitor to believe and defend it henceforth and forever; and if they did not admit of a possibillity of being wrong, they laid all the claim to infallibility which the Pope ever did.

The Professors must be governed by the Creed.

Let it no longer, then, be a matter of wonder, as it is in the minds of some persons, that the Professors at Andover oppose doctrines manifestly reasonable and scriptural, and make war on all the sects proscribed in their creed—they have promised to do it; they have pledged their veracity (a promise and a pledge which they every fifth year repeat); they are paid, cash in hand, for doing that service. And all this they must continue to do so long as they retain the Professorships they now hold.

The founders of the Professorships, in order effectually to guard their gifts, in all future time, against all perversion, *or the smallest avoidance of their true design*, constituted a Board of Visitors to be, as in their place and stead, the Guardians, Overseers and Protectors, of these foundations. These Visitors, previously to taking their seats at the Board, must solemly declare, in the presence of God and the Board of Trustees, that they will faithfully exert their abilities to carry into execution the regulations of the Constitution of the Institution; and, like the Professors, *they* are required "to subscribe the same theological creed," and to repeat a declaration of their faith in it "at every successive period of five years." These Visitors will, of course, keep a

watchful eye upon the Professors, and see that they depart not in any way, nor in the smallest degree from the creed which they are all required to subscribe. And they have power to remove the Professors "either for misbehavior, *heterodoxy*, incapacity, or neglect of the duties of office."

The Professors at Andover are not to be blamed for being Calvinists, or Hopkinsians. Far from this. But they are to be blamed for accepting their professorships on conditions, which exclude all inquiry as it respects the truth of their sentiments. The spirit of Christianity is opposed to such a practice; the spirit of the times is becoming more and more opposed to it; the spirit of our government and institutions generally is opposed to it; and the time must speedily come, (if it be not already come,) when this, and kindred institutions, if there be such, will generally be regarded by the many as monuments of party zeal, and strong sectarian attachments.

Rev. Moses Stuart becomes a Professor at Andover Institution.

Professor Stuart, says one of his friends, "was born at Wilton, Conn., in March. 1780; was graduated at Yale College in 1799; was afterwards tutor for two years in that Institution; he studied law, but abandoned that profession for that of the minis-

try, and in 1806 was ordained Pastor of the Centre Church in New Haven; and in 1810, after a pastorate of four years, was transferred to the chair of Sacred Literature at Andover, which he actively filled till 1848. when he resigned."

His labors at Andover.

"In January, 1810, just forty-two years ago," says Prof. Park of Andover, in the sermon at his funeral, "he was inaugurated Professor of Sacred Literature in this Theological Seminary. His knowledge of the Hebrew then enabled him to translate with the aid of Parkhurst's Lexicon, only five or six chapters of Genesis and a few Psalms. His acquaintance with the Greek tongue was far from being extensive. He was to be a self-made man. In about two years he prepared a Hebrew Grammar without points, for the immediate use of his pupils. They were obliged to copy it day by day from his written sheets. In the third year he published it at his own expense. To print a Hebrew Grammar was then a strange work. He was compelled to set up the types for about half the form of verbs with his own hands. He taught the printers their art. That Grammar he afterwards enlarged and improved in successive editions, and the labor which he has expended upon it would have filled up the life of an ordinary man.

"In consulting Schleusner's Lexicon, he met here and there a German word. No one could explain to him the meaning of it. His curiosity was aroused. At an exorbitant price he obtained the apparatus for German study, and in a single fortnight had read the entire Gospel of St. John in that language. Self-taught, he persevered through Lieber's Biblish Hermeneutik, and this work introduced him to the wide range of German literature. He felt himself in a new world. It was that one volume which, through the generosity of the Trustees of the Institution, enabled him to fill our library with the richest collection of German treatises then in the land. For ten years he performed the rugged work of a pioneer, and in his maturer life he often said, that he did not know how to begin to study the Bible until he was forty years old. For forty years he had been in the wilderness. He entered late in life upon the promised possession. Nor was he merely alone in the efforts of the first ten years of his professorship. To have been simply friendless would have been to him a relief. But the suspicions of good men were excited with regard to the result of his German study. He endured the whisperings of his brethren. Many of them met him with an averted face. Dark predictions

were uttered concerning him; but he kept his eye fixed upon the distant goal. Morning after morning, he sallied forth from his house at five o'clock, through rain, hail, snow, storm; and as his attenuated figure breasted the winds of our cold winters, it seemed a type of his spirit, encountering manfully the opposition, not of foes only, but of friends."

Professor Stuart not a profound thinker.

Professor Stuart's learning was extensive, but somewhat superficial. He had studied much, but he had not concentrated his studies. His learning therefore was more superficial than that of some men. He showed the world all the learning he had. He was neither a sagacious thinker, nor a sound logician. He was ambitious, industrious, untiring, but not acute and far-seeing. Such a man would be in the foremost rank at all times; but he would be liable to make many mistakes. One of his own brethren has said of him, since his death, "The deficiencies of Prof. Stuart's mind are as apparent in his commentaries as any where else. His want of that faculty of rigorous and exact logic which some possess, led him to hold principles sometimes in a rather indeterminate and shifting way, and to apply them with a variable and uncertain method; so that one could

not always be sure that the same interpretation would recur a year afterwards that had been urgently maintained a year before. Timorous minds, who looked for rules rather than principles, and who more desired precise information on special points than general stimulus and enlargement of thought, were sometimes repulsed from the Professor by this. But the rare and great excellencies of his mind and heart were as well expressed in these favorite works."*

*See the "Independent" of Saturday, January 10th, 1852. We do not intend to intimate that Prof. Stuart was not deeply beloved by his brethren. He was indeed beloved; but many of his brethren were not blind to the inequalities (so to speak) of his mind, which evidently was not well balanced. The writer from whom the quotation above was made, says also, "Few sights have been to us more affecting, than the general and spontaneous burst of acclamation, transcending all so-called 'proprieties' and uttering itself in instant clapping and cheers, with which his tall and wasted form was greeted by the men whom he had instructed—men many of them eminent now in station and influence—when he met them at the meeting of the Alumni at Andover a few years since. It was the inevitable homage of the heart, to one who though sometimes abrupt in language was always cordial and generous at heart; and who, though not always implicitly to be followed, was always sincere, self-devoted, believing" The "Christian Register," (Unitarian,) has said, "It was not our privilege to have any personal acquaintance with Professor Stuart. Our knowled of him was gained first from his controversial writings, and afterwards from his more elaborate critical works on different portions of the Bible. He has seemed

CHAP. III.

MR. BALFOUR THROWN INTO DOUBT AS TO THE DOCTRINE OF ENDLESS MISERY.

Mr. Balfour converted by means of Prof. Stuart.

Prof. Stuart, whose connexion with the Andover Institution we have so fully described in the preceding chapter, was the means of converting Mr. Balfour, under the blessing of God, to the belief of the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all men. This, of course, the Professor had no intention of doing. It was a paragraph in his Letters to Rev. Wm. E. Channing, that first attracted the attention of Mr. Balfour to the great subject of Universalism, so far as to raise the suspicion in

to us an ardent, impulsive, earnest, large-souled man, with a vigorous mind, with high and generous aims, and a true religious enthusiasm, carrying with him a vast amount of thought and learning, often more than he had either the ability or the time thoroughly to master. Hence his thoughts were sometimes crude, his measures unwise, and his learning incorrect. His books have great merits, but the want of exactness and of thorough arrangement must prevent their being long standard authorities; though they may furnish the materials out of which inferior minds may prepare the works which shall take their place."

his mind that that doctrine was true. Mr. Channing at the time was pastor of one of the churches in Boston. He had then (1819) become an open advocate of Unitarianism, of which system he had been the principal defender in this country for about four years only. The circumstances which called out Prof. Stuart's Letters to him, will be explained in a subsequent paragraph.

Rise of Unitarianism in New England.

The class of christians called Unitarians, were but little known, as existing in New England, until about the year 1815. Before this time the sentiments of that sect had secretly spread, and some clergymen and laymen, were strongly suspected of holding them, although they had made no *public* avowal which justified such a suspicion. They corresponded with their Unitarian friends in England, to whom they unbosomed themselves. The public avowal of Unitarianism was drawn out in the following manner. Rev. Thomas Belsham, a Unitarian clergyman, of London, in preparing the biography of Rev. Theophilus Lindsey, the father of Unitarianism in Great Britain, devoted a chapter to the history of Unitarianism in the United States, in which he published the epistles, or rather extracts from the epistles, which he had received from his Ameri-

can correspondents. This book, after much delay, fell into the hands of the leaders of the orthodox party in New England; who proceeded at once to publish, in Boston, the chapter referred to. It will be difficult for any one, in the present day, to estimate fully the effect of the disclosure. The Unitarians were charged, by their orthodox opponents, with having studiously concealed their Unitarian opinions. The pamphlet containing the disclosures, was reviewed by a spirited writer in the "Panoplist," the leading orthodox review of that day. So thorough, efficacious and wide-spread was the influence of this review, that Mr. Channing, who had not then received his Doctor's diploma, felt himself obliged to take the field in defence of himself, and his brethren. A controversy of some length was carried on between him and Dr. Worcester, of Salem, Mass. Mr. Channing publicly avowed himself to be a Unitarian. Upon his confessing that he believed in Christ as a distinct being, dependent on God, subordinate to him and deriving all from him, Dr. Worcester said, "Such is your confession of faith: and for this confession, I, dear sir, for one, most sincerely thank you; and hundreds and thousands of Christians, I am persuaded will thank you. It will serve to

relieve us from much of the uncertainty and much of the embarrassment, which, *until now*, we have felt in relation to you and your liberal brethren."* Hereafter Mr. Channing was considered as an avowed Unitarian.

Mr. Channing's Baltimore Sermon.

The storm of the Unitarian controversy had nearly died away, and men's spirits were becoming quiet again, when Mr. Channing, in the execution of his duty, disturbed once more the aspect of the heavens. He was called to Baltimore to preach a sermon at the ordination of Rev. Jared Sparks, in this day the President of Harvard University. The service took place on the 5th of May, 1819. The sermon was one of the most effective ever written by its author,—a calm, dignified, manly, honest statement and defence of Unitarianism, and a thorough, bold, and christian exposure of the absurdities of Calvinism. He departed from the course generally pursued at ordinations; he did not speak of the nature, design, duties and

* This was the first distinct public avowal of Unitarianism made by the late Dr. Channing. In 1808 he preached the ordination sermon of Mr. (afterwards Dr) Codman, of Dorchester, a rigid Calvinist. Up to 1815, Mr. Channing had remained uncommitted, as had almost all his brethren. What their private understandings and mutual concessions might have been, we know not; we speak only of what was made public.

advantages of the christian ministry; but he went into a statement and defence of the doctrines believed by Unitarians, setting them off in contrast with the opinions of his opponents. He unfolded the principles which Unitarians adopt in interpreting the Scriptures, and asserted the doctrines which the Scriptures, thus interpreted, seemed to him to express. This discourse, we think, taken in all its circumstances and effects, was the severest blow, that Calvinism had ever received in the United States. Mr. Channing maintained that the Bible is a book written for men, in the language of men, and that its meaning is to be sought in the same manner, as that of other books. "We believe (said he) that God, when he condescends to speak and write, submits, if we may so say, to the established rules of speaking and writing. How else would the Scriptures avail us more than if communicated in an unknown tongue?" In the interpretation of this book men must use their reason. "We profess to know no book, (said he,) which demands a more frequent exercise of reason than the Bible." He defended at much length the necessity of using reason in the interpretation of the Scriptures. He then proceeded to state some of the views which he derived from the

Bible, particularly such as distinguished him from other christians.

He asserted, 1st. The unity of God. He attacked the doctrine of the trinity in the most open and forcible manner. He showed that the doctrine of the divine unity was clearly taught in the Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testaments. He objected to the doctrine of the trinity on account of its practical influence; it distracted the mind to worship three infinite persons, notwithstanding they might be called one God. 2d. He taught the unity of Jesus Christ; and here again he attacked with great vigor the view taken by the Trinitarian. He then proceeded to treat of the moral perfection of God. He believed that christians had generally leaned towards very injurious views of the Supreme Being. "We believe (said he) that God is good, kind and benevolent, in the proper sense of these words; good in disposition as well as in act; good not to a few, but to all; good to every individual, as well as to the general system." God's justice is but another form of his goodness. Mr. Channing asserted the paternal character of God. He ascribed to Him, not only the name, but the principles and disposition of a parent. He objected to Calvinism that it took away from

men their Father in heaven, and substituted in his place a being whom they could not love, if they would, and whom they ought not to love, if they could. He denounced the doctrines of election and reprobation as taught by the so called orthodox, with great earnestness and effect. He denounced the views which orthodoxy gives of the moral perfection of Deity in unsparing terms. "We ask our opponents to leave to us a God (said he) worthy of our love and trust, in whom our moral sentiments may delight, in whom our weaknesses and sorrows may find refuge. We cling to the divine perfections. We meet them every where in creation, we read them in the Scriptures, we see a lovely image of them in Jesus Christ; and gratitude, love and veneration call on us to assert them." The preacher then proceeded to speak of the mediation of Jesus Christ and the purposes for which he died. Here he asserted the Scriptural view of the doctrine of atonement, in contradistinction, to the harsh, half-heathenish doctrine on the same subject, asserted by those who call themselves orthodox. He condemned the doctrine as a theory, and he condemned it for its practical influences. From these subjects, the speaker proceeded to define the nature of christian virtue, or obedience to

God, under which head he showed that much that passed in the world for religion or moral goodness, or fitness for heaven, was very far from being so. Much that was called piety he believed to be worthless. Such, in brief, was the doctrinal character of the famous sermon which provoked the first letters from Prof. Stuart to Mr. Channing.

Prof. Stuart's Letters to Mr. Channing.

The Sermon of Mr. Channing had not been long before the public, when the letters of Prof. Stuart appeared. The main object of the Professor was to show, that the doctrines of the orthodox party of New England, were not subject to the objections made by Mr. Channing, but were, in fact, truths revealed by the Holy Spirit to men, by means of the sacred Writings. Prof. Stuart seemed particularly solicitous to defend against the assaults of Mr. Channing, the doctrine of the Trinity, the great point of distinction between the two parties. To show that Jesus Christ was the second person in the Trinity,—the one living and true God,—he aimed to prove that he was worthy of the worship of every human being; that christians ought to worship him as God; that Christ ought to be worshipped on earth as he is worshipped in heaven; that if he be the object

of worship in heaven, he should be the object of worship on earth. He hoped in this way to parry the arguments of Mr. Channing, and sustain the confidence of those who believed that the Father and Jesus were the same being. The following paragraph contains his language on this point;

"Phillip. ii: 10, 11, 'That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.' Things in heaven, earth, and under the earth, is a common periphrasis of the Hebrew and New Testament writers, for the Universe; (ta pan or ta panta.) What can be meant by things in heaven, i. e. beings in heaven, bowing the knee to Jesus, if spiritual worship be not meant? What other worship can heaven render? And if the worship of Christ in heaven be spiritual, should not that of others, who ought to be in temper united with them, be spiritual also? Rev. v: 8, 14.' And when he (i. e. Christ, see ver. 6, 7,) took the book, the four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of the saints. And they sung a new song, saying, thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests; and we shall reign on the earth. And I beheld and heard the voice of many angels round about the throne and the beasts and the elders; and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power,

and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever. And the four beasts said Amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth forever and ever.' If this be not *spiritual* worship—and if Christ be not the object of it here; I am unable to produce a case, where worship can be called spiritual and divine." pp. 101, 102.

A remarkable paragraph.

It is difficult to account for the fact that Prof. Stuart should have indited such a paragraph as this. However strong it might have appeared in proof of the doctrine of the Trinity, it is remarkable that he did not see its bearing as affecting the question of the salvation of all men. If all human beings are at last to worship Christ, with spiritual and divine worship, must they not all be happy when they render such worship? and if so, can the doctrine of endless misery be true? There is no way in which we can account for the uttering of *such* an argument, except on the presumption that the Professor did not see the full bearing of what he wrote. We have before stated the fact that he was not a *profound* thinker; he was more specious than sagacious; and this opinion we have confirmed, by

the testimony of some of his own brethren in the church. His opponents, the Unitarian reviewers, charged him with uttering many contradictions. As for instance, in treating of the principles of interpretation propounded by Dr. Channing, Prof. Stuart commenced by objecting to those principles altogether; as he went on to review them, he seemed to *adopt* them one by one, or at least to see but little objection to them; but at last, he excites the wonder of his reader by saying, that the adoption of such principles will eventually lead to the conclusion that the Bible is not of divine origin! "We think (says the Unitarian reviewer) we never witnessed so complete a revolution of opinion, within the compass of two hundred pages. *The wheel has come full circle.*"*

Mr. Balfour thrown into doubt.

Mr. Balfour, of course, read Prof. Stuart's Letters to Mr. Channing, for he was accustomed to read almost every thing, especially on dogmatical theology. He was a firm believer in the doctrine of endless misery, of which he had never had a doubt in his life. If he regarded any thing as beyond all doubt, it was that doctrine. He had a high regard, a great

* See Christian Disciple, for July and August, 1819, p. 322.

respect for Prof. Stuart, as a man of learning, eminent in the midst of the churches, to whom any of his brethren might look with propriety for knowledge, and for assistance in solving difficult matters. He seized his Letters at once, and read them with great avidity. When he came to the passage we have quoted above, his faith was staggered. He was thrown into amazement! What could it mean? Prof. Stuart certainly did not intend to teach the doctrine of Universalism; and yet there seemed to Mr. Balfour to be no way to controvert the statements, nor to receive them, unless he should also receive the doctrine of Universalism, which he had so long regarded as a great error. He expressed his own feelings on this subject in the following language:

"Until the year 1819, a serious thought never occupied my mind, that the doctrine of endless punishment might be false. In the belief of this doctrine I had been educated from my childhood. The books I read; the preaching I heard; and all my religious intercourse; tended to deepen my early impressions, that it was scriptural. Believing it to be so, I had preached it for several years both in Scotland and America. In the course of my reading, I had perused several books on the subject of universal restoration, but they only tended to confirm me in the belief, that endless punishment was true, and that reformation in hell and salvation from it, could not be established from the Bible. I deemed Universalism a great error, sometimes discussed the subject with Universalists and always thought I had the best of the argument.

"The first thing which staggered my faith in the doctrine of endless punishment, was reading that paragraph of Prof. Stuart's letters to Dr. Channing quoted in my first letter. His statements, I was unable to controvert, and the texts on which they were founded, seemed to support them."

Mr. Balfour addresses Prof. Stuart.

As Prof. Stuart had been the cause of Mr. Balfour's doubts, the latter believed it was his right to ask him how he would reconcile his statements with his professed belief in the doctrine of endless misery. Although Mr. Balfour could see no way in which this could be done, he still supposed that the Professor must have some way in which he could do it. It was not as a Universalist, but as an inquirer, a doubter, that Mr. B. went to him. He went almost in a state of alarm; he felt still that Universalism was a great error; he felt somewhat as a man would who had been drawn to the edge of a frightful precipice, and left there, alarmed and dizzy, without seeing any way by which he might retrace his steps. Although he was not afraid of truth, he was afraid of Universalism; he believed it a snare of the devil, and he was afraid he should fall into it. He believed that the Professor would come to his help. Still, it will be seen from Mr. Balfour's whole character, that if Universalism were really true, he would desire

to know it. He felt perhaps there was some danger that he might be deluded merely by error seeming to be truth. He determined therefore, to address the Professor an epistle, which he did in the following terms:

TO MOSES STUART,

Associate Professor of Sacred Literature in Theological Seminary, at Andover, Mass.

Sir,—I have read your letters to Mr. Channing. It is not my object to interfere in the controversy between you, but to call your attention to one thing in them, which is not likely to be noticed by your opponents, but which struck my mind with great force while reading them. As the paragraph is not very long on which I wish to remark, I shall quote it. In your third edition, proving that divine honors and worship are ascribed to Christ, you have the following quotations from Scripture, and observations:

"Phillip, ii: 10, 11—'That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.' Things in heaven, earth, and under the earth. is a common periphrasis of the Hebrew and New Testament writers for the Universe; (ta pan or ta panta.) What can be meant by things in heaven, i. e., beings in heaven, bowing the knee to Jesus, if spiritual worship be not meant? What other worship can heaven render? And if the worship of Christ in heaven be spiritual, should not that of others, who ought to be in temper united with them, be spiritual also? Rev. v: 8—14, 'And when he (i. e. Christ, see ver. 6, 7,) took the book, the four beasts and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden

vials full of odors, which are the prayers of the saints. And they sung a new song, saying, thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests; and we shall reign on the earth. And I beheld and heard the voice of many angels round about the throne and the beasts and the elders; and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever. And the four beasts said Amen. And the four and twenty elders fell down and worshipped him that liveth forever and ever.' If this be not *spiritual* worship—and if Christ be not the object of it here, I am unable to produce a case where worship can be called spiritual and divine."

Such, Sir, are the Scriptures you have quoted, and such are the comments you have given, and this is the paragraph, which arrested my attention. Upon reading it, the following ideas rushed into my mind with much violence: "Things in heaven, earth, and under the earth is a periphrasis for the universe; this universe worships Christ with spiritual and divine worship, and yet Mr. Stuart believes that many in this very universe are to be punished in hell for ever. I paused, and concluded, that I certainly must have read or understood you wrong. I returned, and read with careful attention, the whole division of your subject, in which the above quotation occurs, but found to my surprise I had not. After repeated perusals of

it, and after much reflection upon it, I am constrained to think that you either are, or ought to be, a Universalist. Sure I am, that nothing which I have ever read or heard, in so few words, so conclusively establishes the doctrine of universal salvation. Having received the impression, from reading your letters, that you are a candid, honest man, it has led me thus to address you. I cannot suffer myself to think that you secretly believe all will finally be saved, and publicly profess to believe a different doctrine. I have concluded that this passage of your letters must have been inadvertantly written, or you must have some way of getting rid of difficulties from the texts you have quoted, and your comments, of which I candidly confess my ignorance. The object of this correspondence is to state what has occurred to me, and to request further information from you on this subject.

I am unable to controvert what you say, that, "things in heaven, earth, and under the earth, is a common periphrasis of the Hebrew and New Testament writers, for the universe." My present degree of knowledge leads me to think that this statement is correct. If it be not, I should be glad to see the evidence by which it is disproved. Neither can I, nor am I disposed to dispute that the worship spoken of in the texts quoted by you, is spiritual worship. So sure you are of this, that you say, "if this be not spiritual worship, I am unable to produce a case where worship can be called spiritual and divine." Now, my dear sir, if it be true that things in heaven, earth, and under the earth, is a common periphrasis for the universe; and if it also be true that this worship is spiritual and divine, you certainly have told us that the universe is to worship Christ with spiritual and divine worship. The worship is spiritual and divine, and the universe are the worshippers. Are we able to avoid this? The mind must be differently constructed from mine that can avoid it. Is it, or can it be

believed by any any one, that any beings in the universe who worship Christ thus shall be punished forever? I am sure I never had any such idea; and I have always understood that it was on account of persons not worshipping Christ in this way that they were punished. You certainly cannot think that the punishment of the wicked forever, is in whole or in part to consist, in rendering to Christ spiritual and divine worship. If this be punishment, what is happiness? If this be hell, what is heaven?

It is pretty evident to me from these texts which you have quoted, and the explanations you have given, that the universe is to worship Christ with spiritual and divine worship. Notwithstanding this, I presume you profess to believe that some, if not many in this universe, are to be forever miserable. How to reconcile these things, has been a subject of consideration with me. After turning and looking to these things on all sides, I am unable to devise how you can reconcile them to your own mind, but in one or the other of the three following ways. But as each of these ways present to me some difficulties, I shall state them, hoping that you will assist me, if possible, to remove them. But this must be the matter of another communication.*

I am yours, respectfully,

AN INQUIRER AFTER TRUTH.

*"Rev. Walter Balfour's Letters to Professor Stuart are most able and instructive papers. They are out of print now, but should be in a form to be obtained by all inquirers after truth. Br. Whittemore proposes to publish a Memoir of Br. Balfour, and we hope these Letters will be introduced into that work, for extensive circulation and permanent preservation." See 'Christian Freeman' of January 16, 1852. For the first published copy of this letter, see "Universalist Magazine" of January 29th, 1820.

Mr. Balfour chose, as the medium of the communication between himself and the Professor, "The Universalist Magazine." This was a small quarto sheet, of four pages, which had been commenced in the summer of 1819. Henry Bowen was the publisher, and Rev. Hosea Ballou the editor. With neither of these individuals had Mr. Balfour any acquaintance, nor had they ever seen him. In fact the authorship of the letters was totally unknown to them, or to any one else except the writer of them. He chose the "Magazine," because probably he doubted, whether any other religious paper would be open to such communications; and from the nature of the letters, he had no doubt they would be admitted to the Magazine. Copies of the papers containing them were sent to the Professor, who undoubtedly received them and read them, but he gave *no answer*. It is a subject worthy of a very serious inquiry, whether he could give an answer consistently with his duty to defend the specific creed of the Institution with which he was connected. There were three letters in the first series. We proceed to give the remaining two:

The paper in which the letters were published.

TO MOSES STUART,

Associate Professor of Sacred Literature in Theological Seminary at Andover. No. ii.

Sir,—I stated to you in my last communication, that there were only three ways which had occurred to me, by which you could make the everlasting punishment of the wicked, consistent with the quotation I made from your letters. As each of these ways, presents difficulties to my mind, I shall proceed to a statement of them, relying on you for some explanation.

1st. It occurred to me, that you might believe the universe, would render spiritual and divine worship to Christ, yet hold the doctrine of the eternal punishment of the wicked, by saying, that, "the place of their punishment was without the bounds of the universe." Admitting this to be your view, I admit your statements to be consistent with your belief in the eternal punishment of the wicked. My mind, however, asks, "Is this true?" Do not you think that this is a very fanciful idea? If you indeed suppose that the place where the wicked are to be punished is without the bounds of the universe, please inform us in whose dominions this place is! But as I do not believe you capable of entertaining such a foolish idea, I pass this, and notice,

2d. That it further occurred to me you might attempt to extricate yourself from the difficulties in which the paragraph quoted involves you, in the following manner. In commenting on the passage quoted from Phillipians, you say, Christ "is the proper object of universal adoration." Did you mean by this to inform us that Christ was the proper *object* of universal adoration, but that he was not universally adored? If so, I can easily understand how you hold to the everlasting punishment of some, but then I am unable to reconcile this with the comments which you

have given in the paragraph of your letters on which I am remarking. Remember, sir, you have told us that "things in heaven, earth, and under the earth, is a common periphrasis for the universe." Besides, the texts quoted, and your comments upon them, seem to prove that this very universe renders spiritual and divine worship to Christ. Should this seem the least doubtful from the text in Phillipians, all doubt seems to be removed by the one you quote from Revelation. Notice its language, sir, "And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them heard I saying, blessing and honor, &c." Observe, also, your own language in commenting on this passage. Do you speak of Christ being only "the proper object of universal adoration, but not universally adored?" No, you say, "if this be not spiritual worship, I am unable to produce a case where worship can be called spiritual and divine." John's language does not, and your comment on it does not deny, but as the worship is divine, the universe are the worshippers. On the contrary, have you not said, "things in heaven, earth, and under the earth, is a periphrasis of the Hebrew and New Testament writers for the universe." If this indeed be true, and you are confident that the worship rendered by this universe is spiritual and divine, where do you find your subjects for everlasting punishment, unless among spiritual and divine worshippers of Christ? Are any of them to be the subjects of this? As I am confident you do not believe any such thing, suffer me to appeal to your candor, if there is not a difficulty, which requires your consideration here, and which I hope you will condescend to resolve. You are a man of too much mind not to perceive the difficulty, and my opinion of you is, that you are possessed of sufficient humility to say something by way of explanation.

3d. But it occurred to me that you reconciled the

paragraph on which I am remarking, with your belief of endless punishment, by explaining the universal language of Paul and John in the texts in a restricted sense. Presuming that this is the mode you take of extricating yourself, my desire is to see you do it honorably. The difficulties which have presented themselves to me on this mode of interpretation, will be best presented to you by considering the two passages which you quote, in order.

In Phillip, ii: 10, 11, the word *every* is found twice: "that at the name of Jesus *every* knee should bow, and that *every* tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father." Let us then understand the word *every* here, as not meaning all or every individual, but only *some*, and see how it will suit. "That at the name of Jesus *some* knees should bow of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that *some* tongues should confess, that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father." According to this way of understanding the word *every*, only some knees in heaven bow to Christ, and some tongues confess that he is Lord. But is this true? Are there any such as bow not to, or confess not Christ in heaven? This interpretation of the word *every*, however well it might suit, when applied to persons on earth, and under the earth, it will not do when applied to persons in heaven. Are we then in this passage to understand the word as meaning *all* or *every* individual in heaven, and only *some* on the earth? This would be understanding the word every, in two different senses in the course of one sentence The word every is not repeated, but ought to be understood as repeated, after every thing spoken of in the passage, thus, "that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow of things on earth, and that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow of things under the earth."

And the apostle adds, as including all he had just mentioned, "And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." But in this way of understanding the word every, the passage must read thus, "That at the name of Jesus *every* knee should bow, of things in heaven, and at the name of Jesus *some* knees should bow, of things in earth, and that at the name of Jesus *some* knees should bow of things under the earth." But, supposing that all this was very good, how are we to dispose of the next part of the sentence in which the word every occurs? "And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, &c." In what sense are we to understand the word every, here? Does it mean *some* or *every* individual? If only some, it must refer to, and be restricted by, the things on earth, and under the earth. If it means all or every individual, it is only applicable to the things in heaven. Now, my dear sir, in which of these senses are we to understand it? If the word *every* is not to be understood as meaning every individual uniformly throughout the whole passage, be pleased to refer to some other parallel texts, in which the word every must evidently be understood in two such different senses in the course of one sentence.

But perhaps you may say, "have I not explained things in heaven, earth, and under the earth, to be a common periphrasis of the Hebrew and New Testament writers for the universe," collectively taken, and not in this way of separating its parts. Yes, you have, and to this very thing I wish to call your attention. Let us, then, see how it will do to understand the word *every* as only meaning *some* in the universe. It is a plain case, and stands thus: You make the apostle gravely tell us, "some in the universe shall bow the knee to Jesus, and some in the universe shall confess that he is Lord to the glory of God the Father." Do you think that this was all the apostle

meant to express in the passage? Is this then all the Saviour's reward for his humiliation, sufferings and death, recorded in the preceding verses? Is this indeed all for which God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name above every name, that some knees should bow to him in the universe, and some tongues confess that he is Lord? If we thus modify, and explain away the word every, it is all the apostle did express, and this is all the reward of Jesus' work. It will not mend the matter much, if instead of the word *some*, we should substitute the word *many*. The difficulty still presses, where it most needs to be relieved. Let us see if it does not. "That at the name of Jesus, *many* knees should bow of things in heaven," &c. You may easily perceive that it still makes the apostle say that there are in heaven *some* knees which do not bow to Christ, and *some* tongues that do not confess that he is Lord to the glory of God the Father. Understanding it of the universe collectively, it makes the apostle say, that, "*many* knees shall bow to Christ, and *many* tongues in the universe shall confess that he is Lord to the glory of God the Father;" but I doubt if this is the full amount of the apostle's meaning. If you think it is, I will thank you to make this clearly appear. The things which lead me to doubt, I shall briefly state that you may accommodate your reply accordingly.

The word "every" appears to me to apply equally to every thing mentioned in the passage. It seems to me to be an arbitrary mode of interpretation, to make it mean *every* individual in heaven, and only *some* or *many* on earth and under the earth. Besides, I would submit it to your superior judgment whether the apostle does not, in the conclusion of the passage, encourage us to take the most extensive view of what he says in the beginning of it. After saying, "That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the

earth," instead of qualifying these general or universal expressions, he adds, "And that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." But further, what bears weight in my mind most, is, the connexion in which the passage stands, and the design of the apostle in introducing it. This is so obvious that I need not point it out. I would only say, it seems most natural to me that the apostle, in showing the exalted condition of the Saviour, instead of using language which needed to be qualified, would use language which ought to be understood in its most unlimited sense. I may add, and which has some weight with me, that in the verse preceding the passage under consideration, the apostle uses the word *every*, as I think cannot be doubted must be understood in its most extensive sense. It runs thus, "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above *every* name." Must we change the word *every* into *some* or *many* immediately, for the apostle adds, with the very next breath, "That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow," &c. Must not the every knee that shall bow to him, and the every tongue that shall confess that he is Lord, be as extensively understood as the every name he is above?

As I have not the talent of saying much in few words, I must reserve the remainder of my remarks for one more communication.

Yours, respectfully, AN INQUIRER AFTER TRUTH.*

Conduct of the Editor of the Magazine.

The editor of the "Universalist Magazine," entered not at all into the subject matter, pending between Prof. Stuart and the unknown "Inquirer after Truth." No one but Mr. Balfour himself knew who was the

*See "Universalist Magazine" of Feb. 19, 1820.

author of these letters. That he was a learned man, was evident. He was not a Universalist, unless he misrepresented his own faith; he was merely in doubt; and he was earnestly seeking to know the truth. The editor of the "Magazine" did not therefore interfere, at this early stage, even with a single suggestion or remark. He left the field of inquiry wholly to the unknown writer. The Professor could not therefore complain that he was about to encounter a band of Universalists. He had but one man to deal with, whose name, it is true, was not known; but who was evidently an honest and fearless "Inquirer after truth." The second letter brought no reply, when the Inquirer issued the third.

TO MOSES STUART,

Associate Professor of Sacred Literature in Theological Seminary, at Andover. No. iii.

SIR,—The second text in the paragraph quoted from your letters to Mr. Channing, and on which I wish to make my remarks, is Rev. v: 8—14. To this text and your comments on it I shall now turn your attention. Having quoted at length the above passage in my first letter, I shall here only transcribe ver. 13: "And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever." Let it not be forgotten, sir, that you have told us in the paragraph quoted from your letters in my first

communication, that "things i. e. beings in heaven, earth, and under the earth. is a common periphrasis for the universe." It cannot come within the range of fair debate, that the same periphrasis is expressed in this verse as in Phillipians ii: 10, the passage on which you give us this comment. If there be any difference it is, that in this verse the periphrasis is expressed more fully. Nor is any room left for us to debate whether the worship mentioned in this passage be spiritual and divine. You express yourself clearly and decidedly about this. You say, "If this be not spiritual worship, and if Christ be not the object of it here, I am unable to produce a case, where worship can be called spiritual and divine." The point then to be examined is, how are we to understand the words *every* and *all* which occur in this passage? Understanding these words in a universal sense, you prove, that every being in the universe shall worship Christ, with spiritual and divine worship. What could a Universalist wish you to prove more? But as you profess your belief in the eternal punishment of many, you must modify or explain the words *every* and *all* to mean only *some*. Let us examine this matter and see how these words ought to be understood.

I think it will be frankly conceded, that if any difficulties pressed in limiting the word *every* in the former passage, the same difficulties press in limiting the words *every* and *all*, here. Let us see how limiting these words to *some*, would suit in this passage. 'And *some* creatures which are in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and *some* that are in them heard I saying, &c.' Are we then to understand that some only in heaven are to worship Jesus? But, I presume here, as in the former passage, you would give the word *every* its most extensive sense as it respects creatures in heaven, but its limited sense as it respects those on earth and under the earth. Having remarked on this arbitrary

mode of interpretation already, I pass this over. It ought not to escape observation, that there seems to be something said in this text, which forbids this mode of interpreting the words *every* and *all*. It is this. After John says, 'And every creature which is in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea,' observe, sir, he adds, '*And all that are in them*.' John does not say, 'and all that are in *it*,' referring to heaven; no, but he says, 'and all that are in *them*,' referring to all the places he had mentioned, heaven, earth, under the earth, and in the sea. Does this look like limiting the word every? or understanding both in a limited and universal sense the word every in the very same sentence? This phrase, 'and all that are in them,' instead of modifying the word every, seems to express with the more certainty the universal sense in which it ought to be understood. John, instead of qualifying what he had just said, rather adds something to strengthen and confirm it.

But understanding the words *every* and *all*, as only meaning some, let us see what follows! It makes John inform us twice in the compass of one sentence that some beings in the universe worship Christ. Does John then use all this glowing language, for no other purpose but to tell us twice, that some persons in the universe are to worship him? After specifying all parts of the universe, after telling us every creature in them, yea after adding, 'and all that are in them,' are we only to understand, that some in heaven, earth, and under the earth, and in the sea, shall render to him spiritual and divine worship? It may be so, but your candor will certainly allow, that John's language seems to convey somewhat of a different idea. In your comments on this passage, you say nothing to shew, that the words every and all, ought to be restricted to some in the universe. Your object in quoting it did not lead you to say any thing about this. You quoted it to prove that spiritual and divine wor-

ship was rendered to Christ. But can we learn from the text with more certainty, that Christ is worshipped at all, than we can from your comments, that the universe are the worshippers? Is it more certain from the text and your comment, that the worship is spiritual and divine, than that every creature in heaven, on earth, under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them perform it? May I not then return you your own comment on this passage, with the following addition to it: 'If this be not spiritual worship and if Christ be not the object of it here; *and also every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them perform it*, I am unable to produce a case where worship can be called spiritual and divine, *and where the universe are said to be worshippers.*' The words marked, you will easily perceive contain my addition. I leave you to judge if it be not a very necessary addition to your comment, and equally supported by the passage. By what process of reasoning, and by what laws of interpretation can it be made fairly out from this passage, that every creature in heaven worships Christ, which is only one part of the universe, and that on earth, under the earth, and in the sea, the other three parts of the same universe, only *some* worship him. You are bound to explain why you limit the words *every* and *all* applied to three parts of this universe, and give them in the very same passage an unlimited signification when applied to one part of it.

I am aware, that it may be said by you and others, 'Are there not many passages of scripture, which speak of everlasting punishment to the wicked? and what are these two which seem to speak of universal salvation when laid in the balance with them?' I frankly admit this; but must say, there must be some way in which these opposite texts can be fairly reconciled. About nothing am I more certain than this,

that one writer of scripture never contradicts another, or himself, when we truly understand them. In your letters to Mr. Channing, you have told us, that we are not to adopt rules of interpretation for the purpose of saving the consistency of the inspired writers; that if by the fair rules of exegesis apparent contradictions cannot be reconciled, the credit of the writer must go down. Suffer me also to remind you, that you have also asserted in your letters that the truth of any doctrine, does not depend on the number of passages in which it is taught. That a law once promulged, is not rendered more true by its being many times repeated. Admitting all this, and I do not see how it can be controverted, let us simply apply it to the case before us. If universal salvation be taught in the two passages on which I have been remarking, it is as true as if it had been taught in a thousand. If there be indeed a palpable contradiction between these, and other texts, which speak of everlasting punishment to the wicked, there is no way left but to give up the credit of one or other of the writers. Persuaded as I am, that this contradiction has its origin, not in the inspired writers, but in my ignorance of the scriptures, I use all means to be better informed of their contents. On this account I have taken the liberty to address you for information, how you reconcile the paragraph quoted from your letters, with your belief in the endless punishment of any being in the universe of God. Certain I am, that you are in the possession of knowledge I have not, consistently to reconcile these two things—'That the universe shall worship Christ with spiritual and divine worship, yet many of the beings in this universe be eternally miserable.' If you are in possession of such information, be kind enough to communicate it, and be assured, that it will meet with profound attention from

Yours, respectfully, AN INQUIRER AFTER TRUTH.*

*See "Universalist Magazine," March 4th, 1820.

Such were the first three Letters of the unknown "Inquirer after Truth" to Prof. Stuart. They were written to solicit from Prof. Stuart some explanation, as to the manner in which he would reconcile his statements with his avowed and pledged faith in the doctrine of endless misery. The "Inquirer" believed that the Professor was under obligation to clear away his doubts. "As he had shaken my faith in it, (he subsequently said,) I thought I had some claim on him to say something to re-establish it.

Cause and object of the first three Letters.

"The signature I assumed, '*An Inquirer after Truth*,' though in one sense fictitious, was in another real, for my letters were written in sincerity. I was anxious to see where the truth lay on this subject. And believing as I had done, that Universalists were in a great error, I was also desirous, that Prof. Stuart should so answer my letters, as to convince them of it. It will be easily perceived by the reader, that the three first letters were only embraced in my original design."

CHAP. IV.

PROF. STUART DECLINES TO ANSWER THE LETTERS OF INQUIRER AFTER TRUTH.

The Professor bound to support the Creed.

It cannot be forgotten, by the reader, after what we have said, that Prof. Stuart was bound to support the Creed of the Andover Institution. We know not what rules of interpretation, what principles of latitudinarianism the professors have prescribed to themselves in the interpretation of that formula; but one thing is certain, they were bound to support the Creed, however they might interpret it, "in opposition not only to Atheists and Infidels, but to Jews, Papists, Mahometans, Arians, Socinians, Sabellians, Unitarians and *Universalists*, and to all heresies and errors, ancient and modern, which may be opposed to the gospel of Christ, or hazardous to the souls of men." In view of this fact, we see, in the first place, that Prof. Stuart could make no concessions to Universalism, even if he felt in conscience bound to do so, without

incurring the risk of losing his professorship. He had pledged himself to oppose Universalism; he held his place on that condition ; and he could not therefore do any thing intentionally, even if he might do so conscienciously, to favor that doctrine. Again, being bound to oppose it, he had a very strong reason why he should reply to the "Inquirer after Truth," and refute his arguments, if he felt that it was in his power to do so. While it would be the effect of his subscription to the creed, to prevent his making concessions in favor of Universalism, it would also naturally spur him on to oppose that doctrine, if he felt confidence in the arguments which he might bring forward for such a purpose. How then are we to interpret his silence, except upon the presumption, that he felt that it would be difficult to defend the paragraph in his letter to Dr. Channing, in a way that would harmonize with his own creed and satisfy an honest inquirer after truth. It was evidently then, the safest and easiest for Prof. Stuart, to treat the unknown " Inquirer" as a writer of mere newspaper articles, and thus as unworthy of his attention.

Inquirer urges a reply.

The " Inquirer," at first, felt but little doubt that Prof. Stuart had some way in which he woul dreconcile his statements

with the doctrine of endless misery. He expected daily some communication from him, through the press, on this subject; but he was doomed to disappointment. Four months passed and nothing came. He then adopted one more method, viz. to address a letter to the Professor by mail, that he might be more certain it had reached him and arrested his attention, than he could be, if he depended on the medium of a public journal. He accordingly sent him the following epistle.

JULY 4, 1820.

REV. MOSES STUART:

Sir,—Sometime ago I addressed several letters to you through the medium of the "Universalist Magazine." I requested the numbers to be sent to you in which these letters appeared. No reply being made, I began to doubt whether my request had been complied with. To satisfy myself, I made the inquiry; and in the Magazine of July 1st, the editor informs me that the numbers in which the above letters appeared were certainly sent you. I may therefore conclude that you have seen these letters, though you have not thought fit to say any thing to relieve my mind from the difficulties which your book to Mr. Channing occasioned.

It is probable, upon reading my letters, that you concluded they were written by a Universalist, and were intended to draw you into controversy with them. I assure you that this was not the case. I never knew what it was to be shaken in my faith on this subject until I read your book. The paragraph on which I took the liberty to remark, struck me with all the force I mentioned. My letters were written in the

uprightness and integrity of my heart, and with an unfeigned desire that you would, if possible, relieve my mind from the perplexity which you had occasioned. It is true that my letters have the shape, in some places, of one not writing to have doubts removed, but rather of one writing to defend sentiments most surely believed. This was done with the express design that your reply might be shaped, not merely to suit me, but to convince the Universalists. If they be in an error, some means ought to be used to convince them of it; and no man seems more capable of doing it than yourself, and doing it in the spirit of meekness.

My design in the present communication, is to beg it as a favor that you would say something to relieve the difficulties of my mind which I stated in my letters. As your book has been the means of creating them, I wish from my heart that you may be the means of removing them. But as the paragraph on which I remarked confirms the faith of Universalists, if you deem them to be in error, the interest of truth demands from you some explanation. For my sake, for their sake, and above all for the sake of the truth, I hope you will condescend to do this. I tremble to embrace an error of any kind. If my heart does not greatly deceive me, I sincerely desire to know and obey whatever God has revealed in the Scriptures. Had I been the means of shaking your faith on any subject as you have done mine, I would render you every assistance in my power. This assistance I earnestly request of you. I am fully aware that from your professional and other duties, you cannot spare time to write largely on this subject. I make no such demand. All I wish you to do is, in a brief way to afford me a clue whereby I may be led out of the difficulties which I have stated in my letters. I simply wish you to state by what fair rule of interpretation I can understand the Scriptures and your comments

on them differently, which occasioned my remarks.

Since I finished my letters to you, I have been examining the places in which ta panta occur, which you say means the universe. It will be an additional favor conferred on me if you could so shape your answer as to relieve similar difficulties arising from the following texts in which *ta panta* is found: 1 Cor. xv: 24—29; Col. i: 16—21; Heb. ii: 6—10; Eph. i: 10; Phillip iii: 21, &c. &c.

Any reply to my letters which you may be pleased to make, I presume will be admitted into the Universalist Magazine, the editor of which, instead of avoiding, rather invites discussion. My only reason for not giving my name, is, it would be foolish to afford people occasion of saying I had embraced the doctrine of Universal Salvation, when I am only using every proper means to avoid it. There is no danger of my doing so, if you can state evidence that the views advanced in your letters are consistent with the opposite doctrine. If you cannot do this, how can we avoid being Universalists?

I have only to add that I esteem your talents and character, and sincerely hope my esteem will be increased by your gratifying my wishes in this communication.

I am yours, as formerly, &c.,

AN INQUIRER AFTER TRUTH.*

Character of the appeal.

This was an honest, straight-forward, candid appeal. The "Inquirer" assures the Professor that he had no desire to draw him into a controversy; that he was seeking *light* and *truth* and not victory; that the letters were written in the uprightness and integrity of his heart, with the only desire that

*See Universalist Magazine of Jan. 13th, 1821.

the Professor would, if possible, re-establish his faith in the doctrine he had always been accustomed to believe. If his letters sometimes bore marks as if written by a Universalist, they were so framed only that the Professor's answer might satisfy the Universalists at large as well as himself. He then *begs*, as a favor, that the Professor will say something to relieve him from his difficulties. This he felt the Professor was bound to do. Your book (said the Inquirer) has been the means of creating the difficulties in my mind: "I wish from my heart that you may be the means of removing them." He tells the Professor he ought to do this for the sake of Universalists, as well as for the sake of himself. He does not call for much of the Professor's time. If the Professor could not write many letters, write *one*. If he could not write a long article, write a short one. "All I wish you to do is, in a brief way to afford me a clue, whereby I may be led out of the difficulties which I have stated in my letters." But all this was of no avail; Professor Stuart made no reply. He had plunged the Inquirer into doubt, and there he left him.

Inquirer waits for a Reply.

The Inquirer waited five months to get a reply to the preceding candid

and earnest appeal; but he waited in vain. He then determined on the publication of his private letter to Professor Stuart, which he sent to the editor of the Magazine for that purpose, intimating that he was not ashamed to persevere in his inquiries after truth. He had, during the Professor's silence, given his Letters to Channing a re-perusal; and this would lead to a few more letters, which he should publish. He had nearly abandoned the hopes before cherished that he should get any light from the Professor, and he most sincerely requested any other person to grant him the favor which the Professor declined to give, and save him from error, if he were in danger of going into it. "I shall," said he, "esteem the man who does this my best friend."

Inquirer writes a fifth Letter.

No light came. The Inquirer determined to pursue this subject faithfully. If Universalism was the truth, (contrary to all his former expectations and faith,) he was determined to know it. He sought the truth only, and above all things the true sense of the word of God. His subsequent letters were occasioned by observing things in Professor Stuart's book which he had not seen at first, and by his own investigations of the meaning of certain

Greek phrases.* His doubts of the truth of the doctrine of endless misery became more and more increased. The Inquirer commenced his fifth letter as follows:

FEBRUARY 3, 1821.

Dear Sir,—It is with great reluctance that I again address you. I fondly hoped that you would have answered my former letters, and removed my difficulties. This you have not condescended to do. Since I finished these letters, I have thought considerable on the subject of them. I have also given your letters a

*"The others were occasioned by observing other things in Prof. Stuart's book, and my own investigations of some Greek phrases which he had explained. In investigating the scriptural sense of these phrases, my doubts were increased as to the truth of the doctrine of endless punishment This made me still more anxious that he should come forward with some explanation.

The last of the three first letters was published in the Magazine for March 4th, 1820, to which Mr. Stuart made no reply whatever. After waiting until the 4th of July for some explanation on the subject, I wrote him by mail, urging him to do this. After waiting several months, and still no reply being made, I sent the copy of this letter to the editor of the Magazine for publication. The remaining letters of the whole series soon followed, as their dates show. At last Mr. Stuart condescended to write a brief note, declining all compliance with my urgent requests for an explanation. This note will be given in its proper place. The reader can judge whether his professed reasons for declining all explanation are satisfactory. In his letter he blames me for not giving my real name, and seeking a private interview with him for my own satisfaction. My reasons for declining this are given in the letters, and of them the reader can also judge."

second perusal; but instead of my difficulties being diminished, they have increased. Permit me in as brief a way as possible to state these, still hoping that you or some one else will condescend satisfactorily to remove them.

The reconciliation of all things.

The Inquirer then proceeds to notice the fact, that Prof. Stuart had *repeatedly* asserted that *ta panta* signified the entire Universe which God had created. He then consulted those places in the Scriptures, in which that phrase occurs. And first, Col. i. 15—17—"Who is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature; for by him were all things (ta panta, the universe) created, that are in heaven, and that are on earth, visible or invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things (ta panta, the universe) were created by him, and for him. And he is before all things (panton) and by him all things (ta panta, the universe) consist. And he is the head of the body, the church; who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all things (pason) he might have the pre-eminence. For it pleased the Father that in him should all (pan) fulness dwell; and having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things (ta panta, the universe) unto himself; by him I

say, whether they be things on earth, or things in heaven."

The ground taken by the Inquirer in regard to this verse, and defended at some length, was, that it was the same universe which God had created that is to be reconciled through and by Jesus Christ. The same universe (*ta panta*) is spoken of in both cases; the phraseology is the same, both in the Greek text and English version; and if the Professor held that all things in the unlimited sense were created by Jesus Christ [as God], then should we not conclude they would be reconciled by him? This argument Prof. Stuart never did answer; and it is not presumptive to say, he never could have answered it satisfactorily, without abandoning the creed which he had bound himself to defend. The Inquirer also referred him to Phillip ii., 10— "That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father." These phrases Prof. Stuart had avowed were a periphrasis of the New Testament writers for the universe, and the inquirer showed that Dr. Campbell, in his Preliminary Dissertations (Dis. vi., Part ii., Sec. 6,]

explained them "to include the whole rational creation." On this the "Inquirer" remarked:

"What more pray remains to be reconciled or subdued to God than the universe, the worlds material and immaterial, or the whole rational creation? That something in Scripture very like this is to be found, has been shown in my former letters, from Phillip. ii: 10, 11, and Rev. v: 13. Your own concessions and explanations of these two texts, and the one under consideration, would lead one to think that you believed universal salvation to be a Scripture doctrine. Certainly, nothing that I have ever seen from the pen of a Universalist, is half so convincing to me as what you and Dr. Campbell have conceded or said on this subject."

Not fully a Universalist.

After pursuing and illustrating this argument at some considerable length, the Inquirer drew his fifth letter to Prof. Stuart to a close. He had not come to regard the Universalists with full favor. He rather felt that the Professor had somewhat degraded himself by thus becoming an auxiliary in building up the doctrine of Universalism; but still he had too much honesty and love of truth to flinch from his inquiries, even if they should lead him to embrace that doctrine.

"To conclude this communication, I would observe that it is vain for us to pretend that in the above remarks there is no force. I aver that no man capable of reading them and of putting two ideas together,

can help feeling their force. I have freely confessed the force they have on my mind; and I call upon you to show me my error, if you are able, by reconciling these statements with the idea of limited salvation. Until you or some one else shall do this, I should sinfully abuse the faculties God has given me, and lie with my lips to deny that, this passage has at least the appearance of proving, that it pleased the Father by Jesus Christ to reconcile the universe, or whole rational creation to himself. If I am really mistaken, one thing is certain, Dr. Campbell and yourself have been the instruments of leading me into it, by your becoming hewers of wood and drawers of water to the Universalists. It will not be pretended that I have misunderstood or misrepresented either of you. I have only shown that the statements you have made fairly involve the doctrine of the salvation of the universe, or whole rational creation. If you can show their consistency with the contrary doctrine, no man in the universe will be more obliged than yours,*

AN INQUIRER AFTER TRUTH."

SIXTH LETTER.

In the sixth letter, the "Inquirer" still continues his effort to learn the Scriptural use of the phrase *ta panta*. The next passage which he brought forward was 1 Cor. xv: 24, 28—"Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last

*Universalist Magazine—ii: 121, 122.

enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith, all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things (*ta panta, the universe*) under him. And when all things (*ta panta, the universe*) shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him, that did put all things (*ta panta, the universe*) under him, that God may be all in all."

The subjection of all things to Christ.

On this the Inquirer submits a series of very interesting remarks. He sees here the proofs of the subjection of the whole moral universe to Christ. He dwells on the point at some length.

"This passage demands particular attention. I hope I shall be excused in being somewhat minute in my examination of it.

Let it then be observed, Sir, that '*ta panta*,' which you say means '*the universe*,' occurs three times. To you it is superfluous to add, that it also occurs several times in a form equivalent to *ta panta*. Let us go over in order the things mentioned in this passage.

It is said, 'Then cometh the end.' The question naturally occurs here,—The end of what? I presume it is generally allowed to be the end of Christ's reign. If the question be asked,—His reign over what? The answer from the passage plainly is, his reign over the kingdom which he is to deliver up to God, even the Father. But let us ask again,—When shall the end come? The passage answers: 'When he shall have

delivered up the kingdom to God even the Father.' But let us ask again,—What is to be accomplished by Christ before this end comes? The passage answers: The kingdom shall not be delivered up, and the end come, until 'he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power; for he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet.' And of these enemies the last to be destroyed 'is death.' But the apostle proceeds, 'for he hath put all things under his feet.' It is necessary to notice here what the snme apostle says, Heb. ii. 8—9, 'But *now* we see not *yet* all things (*ta panta the universe*) put under him; but we see Jesus who was made a little lower (for a little time lower) than the angels, crowned with glory and honor,' &c. Compare Phillip. ii. 9, 10, 11. It is true even in our day, that we see not yet all things put under Christ, that is, actually subdued to him, yet we know that he is exalted for this purpose, and the apostle assures us, that—'he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet.' *Ta panta, the universe* was put under him by the Father to be subdued, and when this is fully accomplished, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all. But there are some things in the passage which demand a distinct and more enlarged consideration."

The Inquirer then proceeds to notice the extent of the promised subjection to Christ. *Ta panta*, according to the Professor, meant the universe; it is *the universe* which Christ had created. Can it be said that *ta panta* meant the whole universe when Christ was said to create it, and only a part when it was said he will bring it into subjection? "So long (said the Inquirer

to the Professor) as you maintain that *ta panta* means the whole universe when Christ is said to create it, so long you must expect the Universalist to maintain that it means the whole universe when he is said to subdue it." Again the Inquirer laid down the following rule :

" When exceptions are made to a general subject, all not excepted are allowed to be included. Observe then, that there is one, and only one exception made by the apostle in the passage about *ta panta*, *the universe*, being subdued to Christ. This is God himself. He says, ' But when he saith all things (*ta panta*, *the universe*) are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him.' Can you prove that there are other exceptions? Can you refer us to other texts in which some more exceptions are made? Be pleased to say in what other part of the Bible they are to be found. But as if even this was not enough, the apostle says, that Christ is, to ' put down all rule and all authority and power.' Yea, that ' he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet;' and that ' the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death.' Besides, to shew the ultimate and complete nature of this subjection, the apostle says, ' And when all things (*ta panta*, *the universe*) shall be subdued unto him, then shall the son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all. Will you be kind enough to shew, what, after all this is done, yet remains in the universe to be subdued? How shall all things, or the universe, be subdued unto Christ, and yet a great part of it still remain in rebellion? And how shall God be all in all, if this be the truth? How is it, that the last enemy which is to be destroyed is death, and yet millions of the human race remain forever under

the power of the second death? Do, my dear Sir, explain how the universe is to be subdued and put under Christ's feet, and yet that the greater half of the children of men are to remain in rebellion and misery to the endless ages of eternity?"

The subjection of the universe is voluntary.

Having thus requested the Professor to notice the important arguments which had occurred to his mind, as above described, the Inquirer proceeds to show, that this *universal* subjection (or subjection of *ta panta*, the universe) would be a loving and willing subjection.

"The important question at issue here is, are we to understand this subjection a *forced* or *willing* subjection? Is it constrained by force or fear, or is it the effect of love? Does it consist in the universe being subdued, yet rebels still at heart? or does it consist in all being made loving and obedient subjects? I have used some pains to examine this point with care and impartiality, and shall lay before you the result of my investigations.

"1st. Then, I attempted to understand the subjection mentioned, a constrained subjection, but could find nothing in the meaning of the original word, or circumstances mentioned, nor in the scope of the writer to support this view. If any thing of this nature is contained in the passage, it has escaped my observation. 2d. I next attempted to understand the subjection, as partly constrained and partly of love, knowing that Christ is at least to have some loving and obedient subjects. I found this view would not suit any better than the former. I could find nothing to justify it, but much to condemn it, as shall presently appear. The subjection I saw, must be understood either as universally constrained, or universally of love."

Voluntary subjection further considered.

The Inquirer then proceeds to confess, that it seemed to him, the subjection must be considered to be a voluntary, obedient and loving one.

"1st. It is the subjection of (*ta panta, the universe*) and this subjection is spoken of throughout the whole passage as of the same nature or kind. It is the universe which is to be subdued, and no distinction is made about different kinds of subjection. No hint is given that some shall be subdued by force, and others by love. The universe is put under Christ to be subdued, and all are spoken of as partakers of the same kind of subjection. If the subjection is constrained, it must be so to all; and if we understand it of love, it must be so to all. That this subjection is a willing subjection, or of love, may be inferred, 2d. From the same original word expressing the subjection of the universe to Christ, and Christ's subjection to the Father. No man for a moment hesitates to admit, when it is said, 'then shall the Son also be subject unto him that put all things under him,' that this subjection is voluntary and of love. For what good reason then ought we to understand it otherwise, when the very same word expresses the subjection of the universe to Christ? Consistency and candor require, that we understand the subjection in both either to be constrained, or in both voluntary, for the apostle considered the same word a correct expression for both."

Voluntary subjection further considered.

The Inquirer then went at length into an examination of the scripture usage of the words rendered, subject and subdue; and the result to which he came was, that "in few or none of the places where it occurs, can it be supposed that a constrained

subjection is meant." It is used to signify the subjection of Christ to the Father; of the universe to Christ; of christians to God, to Christ, to his gospels, to civil rulers; of wives to their husbands; of children to their parents; of youth to the aged, &c. &c.

But the Inquirer takes away from the Professor all opportunity of saying that the subjection of the universe, or of any part thereof to Christ, was forced, and not voluntary, by urging upon his consideration the fact, that *he himself* had stated, very clearly and forcibly, not only that the universe shall worship Christ, but that they shall worship spiritually, and after the very model which heaven itself furnishes. "What can be meant [said the Professor, as if nothing else could by any possibility be meant] by things in heaven, i. e. beings in heaven, bowing the knee to Jesus, if *spiritual worship* be not meant? *What other worship can heaven render?*" And again, "If this be not spiritual worship, I am unable to produce a case, where worship can be called spiritual and divine." The argument is complete. It makes thorough work. It drives the nail entirely through and clinches it. And therefore the Inquirer said, in closing his sixth letter, he could see no way to avoid the conclusion

that Christ should continue to reign, until God had put all things under his feet; and when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son himself be subject unto God, that God may be ALL IN ALL.

The Inquirer still cautious.

Clearly as this doctrine seemed to the Inquirer to be taught in the Scriptures, he was very cautious about giving himself up to a full belief of it. He was cautious and doubtful. How did he know that the Professor had not some way in which he could set all these arguments aside? But if he had, he ought to show it. The Inquirer was willing to wait patiently, and in the mean time to pursue his inquiries.

Seventh Letter.

In one fortnight from the appearance of the sixth letter, came out the seventh. It pursued the same subject, viz., an examination of the passages in which *ta panta* occurs.

Sir,—The next passage to which I shall call your attention is, Heb. ii: 8—"Thou hast put all things in subjection under his feet. For in that he put all (*ta panta the universe*) in subjection under him; he left nothing that is not put under him. But now we see not yet all things (*ta panta the universe*) put under him." You will readily perceive that *ta panta*, which you explain to mean the universe, occurs at least twice in this text.

The Inquirer shows that *ta panta* signifies here unquestionably the universe. In verse 7 the Apostle says,—"thou didst set him (Christ) over the works of thy hands," i. e., the works which God had created, or the universe. "He left nothing that is not under him;" as expressed in 1 Cor., xv. God alone is excepted. This proves the full and complete subjection of the universe to Christ in God's time. It is not now fully done. "But *now* we see not yet all things put under him," Heb. ii: 8—but every preparation hath been made by the Father to bring about this sublime purpose. Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, that he might suffer death, was crowned with glory and honor, that he, by the grace of God, might *taste death for every man.* Heb. ii: 9. And at last all the universe, God alone excepted, shall be subject unto him. Having shown these points, the Inquirer (seeing more clearly, as he proceeds, the Scriptural evidence of Universalism,) addresses the Professor in the following pungent terms:

Subjection of the entire Universe further considered.

"Suffer me to ask, how you can avail yourself of *ta panta* as signifying the universe when Christ is said to be the Creator of it, and deny this liberty to the Universalists, when Christ is said to reconcile or subdue it? By what rational means do you slide, or rath-

er leap over this difficulty? Perhaps it did not occur to you in the heat of the controversy with Mr. Channing, what use might be made of your explanation of *ta panta*, as meaning the universe, to establish universal salvation. I think you cannot but feel the necessity under which your explanation of *ta panta* has laid you, to come forward and own yourself a Universalist, or rationally and Scripturally to state, how you reconcile your explanation with your limited views of salvation. Unless this is done, I must think your weapon, forged for Mr. Channing, has wounded yourself. Supposing in the passages I have brought to your view, you should come forward and tell us, that *ta panta* only means a part of the universe, would not Mr. Channing smile to see you thus do away all the force of your argument against him. Unless you admit that *ta panta* means the universe when Christ is said to subdue or reconcile it, how can you look Mr. Channing in the face and maintain, that it means this when he is said to create it. You know this is the strongest argument in your book to prove the divinity of Christ against him; but you must relinquish it, or admit universal salvation. You are too shrewd a man not to perceive the force of this statement, and I hope too candid and honorable to refuse some explanation. I cannot certainly say but you may be able to show how your explanations are consistent with limited salvation, but certainly I cannot perceive how it can be done. I want information."

True cause of the Professor's silence,

Here we think the Inquirer hit on the true explanation of Professor Stuart's remarkable paragraph in his Letters to Dr. Channing. "Perhaps it did not occur to you in the heat of the controversy with Mr. Channing, what use might be made of your

explanation of *ta panta*, as meaning the universe, to establish universal salvation." This was unquestionably true. The statement of the Professor was the honest conception of his understanding, at a time when the doctrine of endless misery was not in his thoughts. After having made such a concession, what was he to do? He could do only one of three things, viz: 1st. Acknowledge himself a Universalist. If *ta panta* means the universe—all things, all the intelligent creation—and if all the intelligent creation shall at last worship Jesus, with spiritual and divine worship, with just such worship as heaven renders, then universal salvation must ensue. But as the Professor could not acknowledge himself a Universalist without losing his place, he was obliged 2d, to show, if he could, that his premises might be true, and yet the doctrine of Universalism not ensue. But this was an utter impossibility. If Prof. Stuart was correct in his premises, the doctrine of endless misery must be false, and the doctrine of Universalism must be true. Then 3d, if Prof. Stuart could not, from any cause, adopt either of the foregoing courses, there was nothing for him to do but to shut himself up in silence; and *that* he did. And in these facts, we think we have

the true view of his case, the true cause of his silence.

Gathering together all things in Christ.

The "Inquirer" proceeded next, in continuing his seventh epistle, to notice Eph. i: 10—in which *ta panta* occurs:

"The next passage to which I invite your attention, is Eph. i: 10—'That in the dispensation of the fullness of times, he might gather together in one all things, *ta panta*, *the universe*, in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth; even in him.' Notice again, sir, that the *all things* here, as in the former passages, is *ta panta*, *the universe*. The person in whom the all things, or universe is to be gathered together, is expressly said to be Christ; and by whom the all things are to be gathered together in him, we learn from verses 3, 8, of the chapter."

The gathering of all further considered.

The following remarks of the "Inquirer" are too important to be omitted. He shows that this gathering together, spoken of by Paul, has respect to the whole moral universe, and that it is the reconciliation of all to God and Christ:

"In reference to the subject before us, there are two things which demand particular attention:

"1st. What is to be understood by the gathering in one all things in Christ? Let it then be noticed, that the Apostle not only says, that it is *ta panta* (which you say means *the universe*) which is to be gathered together in Christ, but he adds, 'both which are in heaven and which are on earth even in him.' I must again remind you, that 'things in heaven and things on earth,' you say, 'is a common periphrasis

of the Hebrew and Greek writers for the universe.' The Apostle then, by your own explanation, makes this matter doubly sure. He first gives us *ta panta, the universe,* and then the common periphrasis of it. You have, then, by your own comments, placed this matter beyond fair debate, that *the universe*, in the dispensation of the fullness of times, is to be gathered together in one in Christ.

"But let us consider what ought to be understood by this gathering together. I presume it will not be disputed that this gathering together is, for substance, the same thing, as is expressed in 1 Cor. xv: 24, 28, by Christ's subduing all things to himself. And the same as is expressed in Col, i: 20, by his reconciling all things to himself, or to take your own comment on this last text, by gathering together all things in Christ, 'seems evidently to be meant, bringing into union, under one great head, i. e., Christ, by a new and special bond of intercommunication, both angels and men.' The subject, the circumstances, and the language in all these texts, are so much the same that they need only to be read, and your comment ought to be admitted.

The same subject further considered.

The "Inquirer" maintains, that it is the same moral subjection to Christ, which is insisted on by the great apostle, in 1 Cor. xv: 24, 28, and Heb. ii. 8, and that it is, not a forced, but a willing subjection.

"I cannot forbear noticing here, that if any further evidence was needed to prove, that the subjection to Christ, 1 Cor. xv: 24, 28, and Heb. ii: 8, was a voluntary subjection, a conclusive argument seems to be furnished in the passage under consideration. Do you ask what this is? It is this, that the gathering spoken of, is a gathering *together*, and a gathering togeth-

er in *one*, yea, a gathering together in one *all things, or the universe, in Christ*. According to the common faith, which I presume you believe and preach, so far from the wicked being gathered in Christ, and gathered together in one in him with the righteous, they are to be separated from them forever. But according to the apostle, and even according to yourself, the universe is to be gathered together again and re-united under one head, Christ. Surely with no propriety can it be said, that the wicked and righteous are gathered together in one in Christ, if this is not voluntary. What kind of re union could it be of the universe in him, if the greater part is to remain in eternal rebellion against God? It must be a strange special bond of intercommunication, by which such different beings are held together. How the wicked, in misery forever, can be said to be *in Christ*, and *gathered together*, yea, *re-united in him* with the rest of the universe, I must leave you to explain, for it is beyond my comprehension.

The restitution of all things.

In drawing his seventh letter to a close, the "Inquirer" takes up the language of Peter, Acts iii: 21, which contained the Greek word *pas* in one of its forms.

"Acts iii: 20, 21—'And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you; whom the heavens must receive until the times of restitution of *all things, panton*, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began.' I need not inform you that *panton*, in this passage, as in Heb. i: 1, 14, is equivalent to *ta panta*, the universe."

The Inquirer contended that the restitution was the settling of all things, like the restoring

of society to order, after wars and tumults. Such is the definition which Raphelius gives the word, according to Parkhurst, and this goes far to win the Inquirer's mind over to Universalism.

"This learned and accurate critic shows that Polybius applies the word in this view, comparing 1 Cor. xv: 24, 25. If this person, whom Parkhurst calls *a learned and accurate critic*, be correct in his explanation of this word, it not only establishes the doctrine of universal salvation, harmonizes with 1 Cor. xv: 24, 28, and other texts, but exhibits something peculiarly pleasing to the mind. What, my dear sir, has this world been, since sin entered it, but the theatre of wars and tumults? So much so, that the heart sickens at the tale of woe, which history and even our own experience afford. Is it not then a heart reviving consideration, that the period is to arrive, when tranquility and peace shall be restored to all the universe of God? But you know, sir, that according to the common doctrine of the endless punishment of a great part of the human race, tranquility and peace shall never be restored to all the universe. No; instead of any thing like this being accomplished at the period mentioned in this text, it is then properly speaking, that eternal tumult and misery are to commence. One thing is certain, that if the word restitution in this passage means any thing good, this good is to all, for it is 'the restitution of all things *panton* the universe.'"

The time of the Restitution.

The Inquirer then considers at what time this "restitution of all things" is to take place. It is to be at the final coming of Christ, (see Acts i: 11); and is the

same restitution of all things, described by Paul, as taking place at the final coming of Christ, and the resurrection of the dead.

"In the passage before us, we are told, 'the heavens must receive him (or rather retain him) until the times of the restitution of all things.' The time then of this restitution of all things, is that mentioned in Acts i: 11, when Jesus shall so come in like manner as the disciples saw him go into heaven.' Observe, sir, the precise agreement of Luke in this passage, with Paul in the passages already considered. They agree not only in the work to be done, but also the time of its accomplishment. Luke calls the work to be done the restitution of all things, and Paul calls it subduing all things, and both agree as to the time, the coming of Jesus." *

Eighth Letter.

Christ, the heir of all things.

We now come to the eighth and last *principal* letter from the Inquirer to Prof. Stuart. It was published in three weeks after the seventh had appeared, and through the same medium. In fact, all these letters had a common channel to the public mind. The Inquirer still dwells, in this letter, on the Scriptural use of the phrase *ta panta.*

"Sir,—The next passage I quote for your consideration is, Heb. i: 1, 4. 'God who at sundry times, and in divers manners spake in times past unto the

*See "Universalist Magazine" of March 24th, 1821, for the original publication of the seventh letter.

fathers, by the prophets, hath in these last days, spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, (*panton*) by whom also he made the worlds; who being the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things *ta panta, the universe*, by the word of his power,' &c."

The Inquirer grows more confident.

In the remarks which follow, we can see evidently, that the convictions of the Inquirer as to the falsity of the doctrine of endless misery, grew more and more strong. He speaks with increasing boldness.

"Notice here, that Christ is said to uphold all things, or, *ta panta, the universe*. Is not this the same *all things*, which in the passage he is said to be heir of? What he upholds, and what he is appointed heir of, are the same, and this is, *ta panta, the universe*. Christ then is appointed heir, or as some translate and explain the passage, 'possessor of the universe.' He is not indeed yet come into the full possession of his inheritance, but we are assured that all things are to be subdued to him. I need not stop to notice, how exactly this passage agrees with Phil. ii: 9, 10, and Rev. v: 13, and your comments on them. Passing this, permit me to ask,—If Christ is the heir of the universe, will he leave any part of his inheritance unsubdued? You know that according to the popular belief, a great part of this inheritance is to remain forever in rebellion and misery. But I ask further, if the greater part of the human race are to live in eternal rebellion and misery, is Christ very highly exalted, or honored, by being appointed heir to such an inheritance? But permit me to ask once more,

if a great part of the universe is to continue forever in rebellion and misery, may it not be said with more truth, that the devil is appointed heir of the universe? And that God hath given all things into his hands? I am shocked, myself, sir, at such questions; but I put them for the purpose of leading you, and myself, and all my readers, to a candid and careful re-examination of this very important subject. It is possible we may be mistaken. Indeed, if we are not, but it is a fact, that all who have not given evidence in this world of being subdued to Christ, are to perish forever, the greater part of the universe of God in ages past have certainly perished."

Christ is able to subdue all things.

The next passage, and the last which the Inquirer quotes at length, in his Letters to Prof. Stuart, is the following, by which he shows that the "Lord Jesus Christ is able to subdue all things unto himself:"

"Phil. iii: 21—'Who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things *ta panta*, *the universe*, unto himself.'

"It is here, as in the preceding texts, '*ta panta, the universe.*' Besides, the word translated *subdue*, is the same as in 1 Cor. xv: 24 to 28, Heb. ii: 8, and other texts already considered. If I have proved that the subjection in these texts, is a willing subjection, the proof equally applies here. In this text Christ's *ability* to subdue all things to himself is expressly asserted, and I presume you will not dispute his *willingness*. Indeed, this is included in the word which expresses his ability. It deserves our notice, sir, that this subjection is said to be '*unto himself.*' This language corresponds to the language of 1 Cor. 15th,

Col. 1st, and other texts, which have been considered." *

Having thus noticed all the passages in which the phrase *ta panta* (the universe) occurs, which the Inquirer judged it necessary to quote at length, he proceeds to classify the remainder, or a portion of them. He finds, he says,

Classification of passages.

1st. That the creation of all things (*ta panta*) is ascribed to God the Father.

2d. That God is said to have created all things (*ta panta*) by Jesus Christ.

3d. That Jesus is appointed heir of all things (*ta panta*) Acts x: 36. All things are delivered to him Matt. xi: 27, given into his hands, John iii: 35, and xiii: 3. And that God hath given him power over all things, John xvii: 2, Matt. xxviii: 18, Comp. John v: 20, and xvi: 15, and xvii: 7.

It cannot have escaped the reader's attention, that Prof. Stuart had thus been the means of opening up to the Inquirer's attention, some of the strongest proofs of Universalism which the New Testament contains, viz:

Strong proofs of Universalism.

1st. That the universe, the *entire universe*,

*See "Universalist Magazine" of April 14, 1821.

shall worship Jesus, with spiritual and divine worship, yea, with just such worship as heaven renders. Phil. ii: 10, 11, and Rev. v: 8, 14.

2d. That God will at last, by the agency of his Son, reconcile *all things* (the universe) unto himself; viz., the same all things that he had created, visible and invisible, thrones, dominions, principalities and powers. It pleased the Father to endow Jesus with the fullness and the power to *reconcile* (not merely to subjugate) *all things*, in this most extended sense, to God and his Son. Col. i: 15, 17.

3d. That Christ will reign, until he hath put down all adverse rule, authority and power,—overcoming every foe, even death, the last: that *all things*, with no exception whatsoever, except God himself, shall be subject to Christ, in the same way and in the same spirit, in which Christ is subject to the Father; and thus God shall be ALL IN ALL. All shall bow to him; all shall confess the Son to be Lord in such a way as to reflect on God the highest glory; every intelligent creature, without any limitation, shall join in the grand eulogium of blessing, and honor, and glory, and power to him that sitteth on the throne and to the Lamb forever and ever; 1 Cor. xv: 22, 28; Comp. Phil. ii: 10, 11; Rev. v: 8, 14; Col. i: 15, 17; and Heb. ii: 8.

4th. That all things, the universe, and intelligent beings in the most extended sense, are to be gathered together in Christ, in the fullness of times. See Eph i: 9, 10. This is the same as bringing all things into subjection to Jesus, and reconciling them all to himself. See the passages before quoted.

5th. That there shall be a "restitution of all things," at the final coming of the Lord Jesus, as hath been spoken by all God's holy prophets since the world began. Acts iii: 21.

6th. That Jesus is appointed *heir of all things.* Heb. i: 1, 4. That all things are delivered to him, Matt. xi: 27; and that "he is *able* even to subdue all things unto himself." Phil. iii: 21.

When we view these texts as they are laid before us, collated and illustrated by the Inquirer, we confess, with devout gratitude to Almighty God, that we see a power in them that no ingenuity or sophistry can paralyze; and not the least lingering doubt remains in our mind, that the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all men, in the fullest sense of the terms, is the doctrine of God and his word; that the salvation of all men is a work for which God appointed, endowed and qualified his holy and faithful Son; that Jesus shall suc-

Universalism undoubtedly the doctrine of God's word.

ceed; that his victory shall be complete; that all his enemies shall die, even death, the last of the vanquished train; and that God himself shall then reign immediately in every heart,—one grand subjection, union, reconciliation having been wrought upon the entire universe, in and over which universe God shall be ALL IN ALL.

Other considerations addressed to Professor Stuart.

Well then might the Inquirer say, as he drew his principal letters to a close,—

"Here, sir, I finish my remarks on the texts in which *ta panta* are found. In concluding, I shall state for your serious consideration, some things which occurred to me in the course of my investigations.

"1st. Is not the number of texts, which I have brought forward, about as many as you have done, to prove the divinity of Christ? If you should say, you only brought forward a few out of the many which you could have adduced in proof of this doctrine; it is likely the Universalist would reply, that I have only afforded a small specimen of the texts, which they could adduce in proof of theirs. But what you observe to Mr. Channing, I think is just, that it is not the number, but the nature of the texts which can prove any doctrine. A law a thousand times repeated, does not make it more certainly a law, than if only mentioned once. But,

"2d. Are any of the texts which you have quoted in proof of Christ's divinity, more plain and explicit than those I have quoted in proof of universal salvation? Does any one text say more plainly and explicitly that Christ is God, than the texts I have quoted say, that *all things* shall be subdued unto him, and

that God hath by him reconciled *all things* unto himself? How then do your texts prove Christ's divinity, and those I have quoted do not prove universal salvation? Pray deliver yourself from this arbitrary mode of explaining the Bible, if you can do it, by some rational explanation.

"3d. Have I, in these letters, or do Universalists, resort to the original languages and put them to the torture to prove their doctrine, that you, and those whom you oppose, do in the controversy about the trinity? This, I think, will not be asserted. The force of all I have advanced, you have furnished me in your criticisms about *ta panta*. I have only shown, that in judging Mr. Channing, you have condemned yourself. So far as I have looked into the writings of Universalists, I find they take our common translation as they find it, and attempt to prove their doctrine by it. Your comments, and your criticisms on the original, as I think I have shown, both tend strongly to confirm them in their opinions. The Orthodox are not more under obligations of gratitude to you for your letters in proving Christ's divinity, than are the Universalists, in establishing universal salvation.

"4th. In any one of the texts on which I have commented, what false rule of interpretation have I adopted, to wrest it from its plain obvious meaning? If my rules of interpretation are false, yours cannot be true, for they are the same. I will feel greatly obliged to you, or any other man, who will show, in a single instance, that I have deviated from your rules of interpretation, or modes of reasoning.

"5th. Could you have availed yourself of as many explanations and concessions from Mr. Channing, as I have done from you and Dr. Campbell, what would you have said? Had he, in a controversy with the Universalist, intimated as plainly that Christ is the supreme God, as you have done that the universe shall perform spiritual and divine worship to Christ, would

you not have quoted him with triumph? You have quoted authors in your letters in proof of your views. I therefore put this question solemnly to your conscience,—Are any of your quotations more plainly and forcibly to your purpose in proof of Christ's divinity, than those I have made from you and Dr. Campbell, are in favor of universal salvation?

"6th. It seems to me, that in proving three persons in the God-head, you are obliged to adopt a course which the Universalists seldom if ever do in proving universal salvation. I shall explain myself. Is it not a fact, sir, that the doctrine of *three* persons in the God-head, is attempted to be proved by passages, and these few in number, by way of inference? These inferences are sometimes not of the most obvious kind. Do not the Universalists quote plain declarations of Scripture in proof of their doctrine? Besides, when you are pushed into a corner by argument, in proving your doctrine, is it not common to take shelter in this—'*It is a mystery.*' Have you ever found a Universalist flee for refuge to any thing like this? It is very common with you, in regard to the trinity to say, '*The fact is revealed, the mode we do not undertake to explain.*' Universalists not only refer you to passages declaring the fact, that all men shall be saved, but to texts showing how this is to be done."*

*These arguments are abridged from the letters as originally printed. The Inquirer puts home the following questions to the Professor: "Had you been brought up a Universalist as you have been a Trinitarian, and were universal salvation an article in the Andover creed, yea, and had your place as Professor, and your temporal interest led you to defend it as you have done that of the trinity, which of these two doctrines could you most easily have defended? Could you not adduce as many, and as powerful arguments, drawn from Scripture, reason and common sense, to support the one, as you have done in support of the other? I think you would at least hesitate to answer this question in the negative."

In the following paragraph, the Inquirer touches subjects of vast importance; and one can scarcely refrain from exclaiming, "he is not far from the Kingdom of God;" although he still remained in some doubt:

"7th. Whether does the doctrine of universal salvation, or its opposite, give the most honorable and amiable view of the character of God, and which is most calculated to produce peace and good will among men? As to the first of these, little need be said, for surely if the doctrine of universal salvation can be fairly and fully established from the Bible, it, to the reason of men, has the preference. It is not very easy for us to see, God's character honorable and amiable, in bringing a vast number of beings into existence, whom he foresaw would be (not to say as some do predetermined that they should be) forever miserable. I never found one who thus talked about God's dooming some to endless misery, that ever believed themselves of this number. To say the least, those who thus speak of such a tremendously awful subject, have given too just cause for Universalists to say,—that the God of such persons, if they say the truth about him, is very like a tyrant. As to the second, certainly the doctrine of universal salvation, if it is proved to be true, has the advantage of the other in promoting peace and good will among men. The doctrine is what every unbiassed, benevolent mind wishes true, if consistent with the will of God. It is what every good man prays for, that all may be saved, and what his exertions go to promote. Admitting the doctrine true for a moment, though men might look on each other as wrong in many respects, yet not as finally to be excluded from happiness. Contemplating each other as children of the same Father,

and finally to enjoy the same blessedness in heaven, it is surely better calculated to beget peace and benevolence among them, than the opposite doctrine which leads to endless strife and contention here, and one party consigning the other over to endless misery in the world to come. If the doctrine can be proved beyond dispute true, I think you will allow, that all the religious sects may bear with each other, yea live in union together.

"8th. It is not true, as some have affirmed, that this doctrine leads to licentiousness. Say some, if I believed this doctrine true, I would take my fill of sin. This, sir, I have always considered very unfair treatment of the Universalists. It will be used by no man, who does not wish to excite popular prejudice against them. The same argument was brought against the apostles, and indeed is to this day brought against every man, who preaches the grace of God as they did. If the grace of God teaches one man to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, it also teaches all who know it. If it teaches one to say, it teaches all to say,—'Shall we sin because grace aboundeth? God forbid. How shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein.' No Universalist that I have heard of, ever held the doctrine that men were saved *in their sins, but hold that all men are or will finally be saved from their sins.*

"9th. But you may say, are there not many passages of scripture which seem irreconcilable with the doctrine of universal salvation? I admit this, but submit for your serious consideration the following remarks. Are there more texts to be found which appear irreconcilable with universal salvation, than there are found which seem irreconcilable with the doctrine of the trinity?

* * * * * * * *

"I have called, and do again call upon you to show, how they can be reconciled. When you have done

this, it is no more than reasonable that you demand of the Universalists to reconcile their doctrine with those texts which are at variance with it. If their views are at variance with the Scriptures, I think I have shown that you are at variance with yourself. Could I have quoted as much from a Universalist, as I have done from you in favor of eternal misery, would you not have said that he contradicted his own received doctrine? But I have further to remark, that though we may in our writings contradict ourselves, one thing is certain, that God does not contradict himself in the Bible. The contradictions men perceive there, arise from their ignorance, and vanish as they become better acquainted with it. I do study this book, and wish to avail myself of every means to ascertain its true meaning, for, to ascertain this, I most cordially agree with you is true Orthodoxy. That we may both study it as we ought, be taught by the spirit of all truth to understand it, and confess and practice what it reveals, is the sincere desire of yours, respectfully,*

INQUIRER AFTER TRUTH.

*Universalist Magazine—vol. ii: p. 166.

CHAP. V.

The Inquirer becomes a Universalist and avows himself.

Inquirer makes one more effort.

The Inquirer still waited with earnest, but somewhat weakened expectations, for Prof. Stuart to appear to deliver him from the danger of embracing error, if indeed the doctrine to which his mind had been turned were an error. No reply came. All his inquiries were leading him further onward towards Universalism. He prayed earnestly, if that doctrine were not true, that he might not be left to embrace it; but if it were true, he was determined to know it. He sought to gain the true sense of the word of God. He did not utterly despair that the Professor would help him. He was tempted to write him once more. His feelings were these: he wished the Professor to know to what result his "Letters to Channing," aided by the Inquirer's own investigations, were likely to lead him. He still hoped the Professor might make an effort to save him from Univer-

salism. He resolved to write *once* more, for it could harm no one, if it did no good. This letter he published in the Universalist Magazine, for June 16th, 1821.

The Ninth Letter.

"Sir,—Permit me only once more to address you. If you thought my communications unworthy of an answer, you might have said so in a few words, and perhaps I might have been satisfied. At the time I wrote them, I considered there were things stated which required some explanation from you, and have not yet seen any reason to change my opinion."

He intimates he may publish a book.

The following extract will show, that the Inquirer had conducted his inquiries on an extensive scale. He hoped, and yet he trembled. He feared, if he meant to remain an honest man, he must become a Universalist. Hear him.

"Since I first wrote you, the little time I can spare has been employed in examining this subject. I have directed my attention to the Scriptures, and all my researches are conducted with this view, to ascertain what is truth. The plan I have laid down, is on an extensive scale, and I find it will take much time and labor to finish it It has cost me much time and labor already, and I increasingly find it will require much more, before all my researches are completed. I do not wish to anticipate the final result, but so far as my investigations have yet been conducted, I fear that if I am an honest man, I must be a Universalist. Now, my dear sir, I wish you, on reading this, to pause and ask yourself, 'Am I doing right, not to interpose to

prevent this result? Can I thus suffer a man to be led astray by anything I have written, after such repeated and earnest solicitations for necessary explanations? Should this man perish, and others through his instrumentality, all originating from my book, can I wash my hands and say, I am clean, your blood be upon your own head?' The God of heaven be witness between us, that the statements on which I took the liberty to remark, were the means of shaking my faith, and yet you refuse to say anything to re-establish it. I solemnly declare that I have been sincere in all I have written, and unfeignedly have desired, that you would show me, if possible, how you reconcile your statements with the doctrine of eternal misery. I have urged you until I am ashamed, yet you assign no reason for your silence. What am I, sir, in such a case to do? Is there any other alternative left me, but either to shut my eyes, quiet my convictions, and sit down contented, an implicit believer in the doctrine of eternal misery; or, to gird myself to the task, candidly and patiently to examine this subject fully for myself? The last of these I prefer, and if life and health be granted me, I shall give it a very full investigation. Should my inquiries end, as I fear they must, you may, perhaps, have an opportunity of seeing that I have neither hastily nor carelessly made up my mind on this very important subject. The observations I have already by me, collected in my examination of the Scriptures, are by far too voluminous for Magazine communications. I shall not trouble the world with another book, if I have not something to offer on this subject, strong and conclusive. I feel a solemn responsibility for what I may write, knowing that it will outlive me, and may be doing much mischief in the world, when it is out of my power to prevent it. If you have got anything to offer, I entreat you now to produce it. I am open to conviction. What is truth is my object, and to argument and evi-

dence drawn from the Scriptures, I shall pay attention, from whatever quarter they may come. To any other mode of settling this question, I shall be like the deaf adder. When once my investigations are finished, and I am fully satisfied that the Bible teaches no such doctrine as endless misery, I shall neither be afraid nor ashamed to avow it, and, if necessary, to defend it. My views may then possibly be submitted to you and the world at large for examination."

From this heart-stirring appeal, the Professor could not turn away. Policy even required him to say something, and he therefore sent the following epistle to the editor of the "Universalist Magazine," under date of Andover, June 19th, 1821: Prof. Stuart answers.

PROF. STUART'S LETTER.

To the Editor of the Magazine:

"Sir,—I acknowledge the receipt of several numbers of your paper, containing letters addressed to me, by some anonymous author. In a recent number, which I have received, the author seems to take it hardly, that I have not noticed any of his former communications. I have surely had no intention to treat him ill; and I believe I may venture to say, that he has no just reason to complain of me. Anonymous animadversions in newspapers may be replied to by those who have no other occupation which prevents their engaging in composing pieces of such a nature. But every man, who is deeply engaged in professional business, may surely be excused from this kind of warfare.

Besides, if your correspondent be really a serious inquirer after truth, as he professes to be, he could certainly choose some better method of research than

by writing newspaper criticisms. Can he candidly believe that I am obliged to spend my time in *writing* discussions, for the satisfaction of a single individual, which would occupy the time that must be spent in performing duties that relate to many? or does he think that I love to court disputes? In his private letter to me, why did he not, like an honest inquirer after truth, give his name, that I might reply to his letter? Or why, if he wishes to know my sentiments relative to his exegesis of certain passages of the Scripture, did he not call on me, or seek an opportunity of personal and friendly conference? This he could have at almost any time.

In short, to speak plainly, I have thought from what I have read, that your correspondent has already fixed his system of belief, and only wished to solicit to a dispute. For this I have no desire; though of it I have no fear. But I must know the name and object of my antagonist, before I enter the lists; and contend on some other ground than that of a newspaper.

If your correspondent is not satisfied with these reasons, he can easily obtain satisfaction by a friendly conference. I am indeed quite unable to reason as he does about the meaning of the Scriptures; but I cannot spare time to give the reasons for such dissent in writing, at present.

Your obedient servant,*

M. STUART.

Character of the Reply.

It is evident that Prof. Stuart, like every body else, was totally ignorant who the Inquirer was. He objected to his animadversions, because they were anonymous, and because they were published in newspapers. But

*See Universalist Magazine, vol. iii. p. 1.

such objections as these must be considered frivolous, when men's consciences, and their hopes for time and for eternity are at stake. Would the Professor stand by in silence, and see men led away to believe doctrines he considered dangerous—doctrines that might ruin them forever—when the writing of a newspaper criticism to an anonymous suppliant [for such the Inquirer truly was] would save them? He would, we think, have done no such thing; and we are compelled, therefore, reluctantly we acknowledge, to regard his objection as a subterfuge. The Professor was very anxious to know *who* this Inquirer was. He was fearful he was some real Universalist in disguise, who was seeking to get him into a dispute. He wished a *personal* conference with him, that if possible (as we judge) the matter might be hushed up. But the Inquirer was too honest to be turned from his purpose. He had assumed no disguise; he stood before the world, professing to be precisely what he was, an open, honest, fearless Inquirer after Truth.

Attempt to ascertain who Inquirer was.

The Inquirer responded to the Professor's epistle. In the meantime a new editor had taken charge of the "Universalist Magazine," who, on the reception of the Inquirer's rejoinder, made an effort to learn who

he was. The curiosity among Universalists on this point ran very high. A letter was deposited in the Boston Post Office, directed to an "Inquirer after Truth;" and there was an understanding with the Clerk of delivery, that when this letter was called for, he should learn, if possible, who took it; and if a messenger called for it, it was to be inquired by whom he was sent. To facilitate this plan, the following paragraph appeared in the Universalist Magazine:

"An Inquirer after Truth, in answer to the Rev. M. Stuart (in the first number of vol. 3d) is received. The apparent sincerity and candor exhibited by the writer, would entitle his essay to higher consideration, and render it equally interesting to the generality of our readers, had he, in expressing his sentiments on the subject, paid stricter attention to conciseness and perspicuity. His answer, however, is under consideration; in the interim, he will find a letter in the post office." *

The Inquirer, however, was too wary for the editor of the Magazine; he never made any application for the "letter in the post office." It still remained a profound mystery who he was.

Inquirer notices the Professor's Letter.

It was to be expected that the Inquirer would pay suitable attention to the Professor's letter. He read it very care-

*See Universalist Magazine, vol. iii., p. 16.

fully; he took time to reflect upon it, when he published an epistle to the Professor, in the "Universalist Magazine," which closed utterly his communications to him. We make the following extracts:

"Sir,—I am glad you notice my communications, but am sorry you do not comply with my reasonable request. You do not deny but that it was *reasonable*. It even seems to be admitted, that your statements on which I remarked, are at variance with the doctrine of eternal misery. I am not charged with having misunderstood you, treated you uncandidly, or used unkind and disrespectful language. You do not say your statements are false, nor do you profess yourself able and willing to reconcile them with this doctrine, but say things of me, which, upon reflection, I think you must regret. For example, that I am not a serious and honest inquirer after truth; my system of belief is already fixed; and that I am your antagonist, and only wish to solicit a dispute with you. Of the truth of these charges, I leave others to judge, from what I have written. I can only say, my conscience bears me testimony, that in every one of them you are mistaken. Only show how you reconcile your statements with the doctrine of eternal misery, and, however unsatisfactory your explanation may be to my mind, I shall be silent, unless you desire my further correspondence. This is the sum of all I ever requested. This, my dear sir, is all I ask.

* * * * * * * *

"I was fully aware that your time did not permit you to write at large on this subject. Such a demand I have never made. All I have requested, is, that in the briefest possible way, you give me a clue, or a few hints, whereby I can reconcile the statements you

have made, with your belief in eternal punishment. You must have the *name* and *object* of your *antagonist*, and even then you will not enter the list with him on the ground of a newspaper. I never was, my dear sir, your antagonist. I never wished to enter the list with you, or solicit a dispute. How you can be yet ignorant of my object, is to me surprising. It is, then, for your information, this,—*Rationally and scripturally to reconcile your statements, on which I used the freedom to comment, with the doctrine of endless misery.*

* * * * * * * *

"My reasons for not giving my name at first, and why I yet decline doing so, I shall now briefly state. First, then, because the world is ruled by names. As your name gives weight and force to all you say and write, I am not willing that mine should be the means of rendering *useless* anything which I have to advance. Let men judge what I say, uninfluenced by my name. Farther, I had no occasion to give my name, for I was not writing an answer to your book, but only requesting some explanation from you about a very small part of it. Besides, you could as easily show, without my name as with it, how you reconciled your statements with the doctrine of eternal misery. How my name could be of any service to you about this, I am unable to perceive. I may add, that *common prudence* dictates I should not give my name until my mind is brought to some decision on this subject. You have unsettled my mind. I have urged you to say something to *establish* it; and, until this is done, or I am convinced that the doctrine of eternal misery cannot be supported from the Bible, why should I give people occasion to say I had become a Universalist, when I am only using means to avoid it.

* * * * * * * *

"But a still more powerful reason than all these has operated with me, not to seek satisfaction by personal conference, or private letter. It is the following: I

am not the solitary individual, my dear sir, who has been, or is likely to be affected by your statements. Every reader of your book is liable to this. That reader is no honor to you, nor will he profit himself much, who reads your book so carelessly as not to perceive that your statements strongly go to prove the idea of universal salvation. So long as the sun and moon endure. you may be quoted to prove this doctrine. A writer in the Universalist Magazine avers that he never saw, in so few words, anything so conclusive in support of their sentiments. Though this writer is unknown to me, and though I have never conversed with a single individual on the subject, I venture to say that this declaration is that of the whole body of Universalists. I go further, and say that no candid, reflecting man, who reads your book with attention, but must be of the same opinion. You see, then, that with such impressions, I did not consider myself writing as you intimate, 'newspaper criticisms,' to oblige you to spend your time 'in *writing* discussions for the satisfaction of a single individual.' No, my dear friend, I wished you to write for the benefit of *all* the Universalists, of *all* who read your book; yea, of thousands yet unborn. You presume too much if you think the Universalists so dull as to overlook the pertinent statements you have made in their favor. Had I not brought them to view, long before now, they would likely have quoted you triumphantly. Why, then, blame me for not privately conferring with you for my own satisfaction; when so many require also to be satisfied, how you reconciled your statements with your professed belief. I think you rather ought to be thankful that thus you had a fair opportunity of retracting your statements, or showing to all men how you did reconcile them.

* * * * * * * *

"May I use the freedom to suggest that your time would not be unprofitably spent, in showing to the

young men under your care, how you reconcile your statements with the doctrine of eternal misery; and pointing out to them the fallacious nature and pernicious tendency of my reasoning about the meaning of Scripture? For my benefit, and that of the Universalists, yea, of all others, you might easily give an abstract of your labors. I have to complain of the want of time as well as you. Be assured, sir, it was not for the want of any other 'occupation,' I have engaged in writing. That man must be very busy indeed, if, in a similar state of mind with me, he cannot redeem a little time to have his mind informed, and established on such a subject as the one before us. I really think you might have found a few moments to reconcile your statements, and prevent their evil tendency on me, and *others*. About this subject, it is impossible for me to be at rest, until I either obtain satisfaction or can persuade myself that the future eternal conditions of men are mere trifles.

"It appears to me that you have some secret conviction that I am in league with the Universalists, and that all this writing is intended to involve you in a controversy with them. If it were so, I can see no possible reason you can have for declining an explanation, how you reconcile your statements with eternal punishment. But I assure you no such thing is the case. What I have said is in the sincerity of my heart, and with *no man on the face of the earth have I ever exchanged a word on this subject*."

The Inquirer's last words to the Professor were,—

"Should you feel disposed to give me the information I have requested, I shall consider myself as very much obliged to you. If you have not time to do this, would you be kind enough to refer me to some work in which I may find this information. If you

decline both, you shall not very soon hear again from me, as I wish to devote all my leisure moments to the investigation of this deeply interesting subject. If want of time be the reason why you do not reconcile your statements with the doctrine of everlasting misery, I am sure it cannot be for want of talents. Perhaps some may suspect that it arises from the impossibility of the thing. To me, at present it appears to be impossible. It is one thing for you not to fear a dispute with me, and quite another to perform an impossibility. If it can be very easily done, it only makes me the more urgent that it *should* be done.

I am yours, &c.,*

AN INQUIRER AFTER TRUTH."

The Inquirer turns away from Prof Stuart.

The Inquirer then had no farther prospect of getting any light from Prof. Stuart, and he determined to apply to him no more. Nothing remained for him to do as an honest man, but to go very thoroughly into the examination for himself, that he might know whether the doctrine of endless torments, and other kindred dogmas, were taught in the word of God. To that high standard he went. He sought truth, and truth alone. His prayer was, "lead me, O Lord, in the right way." He gave all his leisure hours to this investigation. He was seen continually studying the Bible, and the best writers on the sense and the proper manner of the interpretation of the Scriptures. He re-

*See Universalist Magazine, vol. iii., p. 25.

solved to leave no means untried to make himself acquainted with the views of the sacred writers on the great subject of the extent of salvation.*

Inquirer dreaded to become a Universalist.

Some supposed that he was somewhat *afraid* to become a Universalist; that he was rather seeking means to avoid it, if possible. One writer addressed him through the Magazine, quoting his words, "My only reason for not giving my name is, it would be foolish to afford people occasion of saying I had embraced

*The Inquirer said, some years afterwards, "When Mr. Stuart declined all explanation how he reconciled his statements with the doctrine of endless punishment, I determined to make a pretty thorough examination of the subject for my own satisfaction. The substance of my investigations has been published in my first and second inquiries, essays, and other publications. Whether my books have done any good or evil to the world, the world has Prof Stuart to thank for them. When I wrote those letters, I had as little thought of writing a book in favor of universal salvation as of creating a new world. All my prejudices, and habits of thinking, as well as my honor and interest, were strongly in favor of the doctrine of endless punishment. To Mr. Stuart, of Andover, I am indebted for making me a Universalist, and to him the world are indebted for my books. If I have embraced an error, and have published it to the world, let all who think so, know, that he is the man who led me astray; was urged to give some explanation, but declined it; and that nothing has been said by him or any person, to show me my error. His Exegetical Essays do not touch the points discussed in the following letters."

the doctrine of universal salvation, when I am only using every proper means to avoid it." "I should think, sir, (said the writer) if the doctrine of universal salvation were as congenial to the benevolence of your soul as you have represented it to be, you would not use every proper means *to avoid* believing it."* Inquirer had frequently intimated, that he rather dreaded to become a Universalist; it was not his wish, but he *feared* he should be obliged to do so, if he meant to remain an honest man. It was this which led the individual from whom we have quoted to address him. Universalists generally supposed the Inquirer somewhat dreaded to embrace their doctrines; and this seemed to them an unfavorable reflection upon God's truth. Why should a man *dread* to be brought to believe, that all God's intelligent creation will at last be made holy and happy? Is it not what he would pray for? Would it not increase his peace of mind? Would it not make him a happier man?

Inquirer's explanation on this point.

To suggestions like these, the Inquirer was not blind. In the spirit of open-hearted candor, he replied as follows:

*See Universalist Magazine, vol. iii., p. 40.

"It must be evident to every candid man, that my mind was far from being decided; yea, my very writing was for the purpose of obtaining light to form a correct decision on this subject. I had formerly believed that universal salvation was a very pernicious error. Until I therefore had seen sufficient evidence to convince me that I was mistaken, it would ill become a candid inquirer after truth not to use all proper means to avoid it. This I applied to Mr. Stuart to assist me in doing, which I am truly sorry he declines doing. On the other hand, my letters surely may be allowed to speak for themselves, that I was not using means merely to avoid this if it was an error, but was also using means to ascertain if this might not be truth, and that I had been formerly mistaken. Seeing Mr. Stuart declines satisfying my mind, I have girded myself to the task of making an extensive inquiry for my own satisfaction on this subject. When I shall be able to finish the course of investigation I have prescribed for myself, it is impossible for me at present to say; perhaps sometime in the course of the coming winter. The time I have to devote to this is but little, especially in summer. I anticipate the long evenings, when, if my health be continued, I hope to bring to a conclusion my present investigations. It is impossible for me to change my opinion on such a subject as this, as easily as I could shift my clothes.

"If you or any one else think that when convinced of the truth of universal salvation, I would be ashamed or afraid to avow it publicly, only exercise patience for a few months and you may find yourself mistaken. I can assure you I have no place nor pension at stake by a change of opinion. No man can be placed in a situation more favorable, free from all worldly temptations to either side of this subject, so as to give it an impartial examination. In short, as I have nothing to hope for by a change of opinion, I have as little to

fear, except it be to defend the new sentiments which I may embrace. This I wish to be prepared for, should my investigations terminate, as I think they must, in the belief that universal salvation is the doctrine of Scripture, when it is justly interpreted."

He pursues his inquiries.

It will have been observed, that the Inquirer said, "I have girded myself to the task of making an *extensive* inquiry, for my own satisfaction, on this subject." He pursued this inquiry very faithfully. His friends knew not what he was engaged in, and perhaps not even his own family were aware the course his mind was taking. For a time he ceased to attract the public attention. He sunk, as it were, out of sight. Some had begun to forget him, and his letters to Prof. Stuart, which had come to be regarded somewhat, merely as things *that were*. But the Inquirer's mind was never more active than during this time. He had quite fully investigated the evidences furnished by the New Testament writers, in favor of the ultimate holiness and happiness of all men, in the course of his letters to Prof. Stuart; but there was another class of texts to be examined, viz., those which had been commonly used to support the opposite doctrine of endless misery. During the time we have mentioned, when the public knew not what the Inquirer was doing, he was engaged

in the examination of these texts, and especially of those in which the word *hell* occurs, which had been regarded as the strong foundation of the awful doctrine we have mentioned. He pursued these inquiries, until he became fully satisfied, not only that the doctrine of the salvation of all men was revealed in the word of God, but that there was not a passage, in any part thereof, which, when properly understood, taught a contrary doctrine. The Inquirer took time for a very careful examination; and the result was, that he found himself convinced, beyond the shade of a doubt, that Universalism was sustained by the word of God.

Inquirer avows himself.

He was not a man to flinch from a candid avowal of what he fully believed. He now saw that Universalism was a plainly revealed doctrine of the divine word; and that not a text in all the book of God, when understood in its original intent and signification, furnished the slightest objection to that doctrine. He felt it his duty, therefore, to avow himself. On the morning of the last Sabbath in May, 1823, he opened his mind, on the great subject, to the little flock to whom he had been accustomed to minister at Washington Hall, testifying to them, before God, that he had been brought to

believe in the final reconciliation of all things, as a fact clearly and fully revealed in the divine word; and declaring, that in his judgment, there was not a text which could be properly used in opposition. He gave them some of the leading evidences of what he believed. What the consequences of this avowal might be to himself, he did not stop to inquire. He clearly saw that Universalism was God's truth; he *knew* it was his duty to avow and defend God's truth, and impress it upon the minds of men; and whether they would hear, or forbear to hear—whether they would love him more or less for his change—he *must* declare it.

Consequences of the avowal.

There was much excitement in Charlestown, on the succeeding day. The little flock, who first heard the intelligence, were amazed. They knew their pastor's conscientiousness; they knew he was an honest believer of what he had avowed; they knew they could not turn him from his purpose, even if they wished to do so; and nothing remained for them to do but to adhere to him as a Universalist, or to forsake him altogether. The change in his opinions became at once the subject of conversation, not only between the members of his little flock, but between those of the other re-

ligious societies in the town, and especially among the Universalists. They had always respected him for the quiet and peaceable life he had pursued, in all godliness and honesty. When they learned that *he* had become a Universalist,—a fellow believer with themselves,—they rendered thanks to God; but when they learned also that he was the author of the Letters to Prof. Stuart, which had excited so much speculation in regard to the authorship, their joy became still greater. They looked upon the conversion of Mr. Balfour as an eminent triumph of divine truth. It was the victory of truth over long cherished and honestly believed errors. The Universalists could not but make the comparison between this conversion and the conversions that had taken place under the preaching of the partialist divines. Those preachers proselytised the young, the thoughtless, the ignorant, merely by working upon their passions, without communicating to them any proper knowledge of the Scriptures, and by such conversions, they filled up their churches with a class of professors, who knew very little of the word of God, and who felt sometimes but little of the spirit of Christ. But Mr. Balfour had been made a Universalist by a diligent and prayerful study of the

Scriptures, against the influence of long cherished opinions, and with the help of a thorough theological education. He was regarded by the public as a profound scholar, who had had the advantages of a liberal education, and who understood the original languages in which the Bible was written. That such a man should, in such a manner, be brought to the knowledge of the truth, avowing his faith cheerfully and openly, was indeed an eminent triumph of the gospel; and it gave great satisfaction to the Universalists of the country.

The following announcement appeared in the "Universalist Magazine" of May 31st, 1823:

ANOTHER CONVERSION IN THE MINISTRY.

"The Rev. Mr. Balfour, who has been for several years a Baptist minister in Charlestown, Mass., has recently become a Universalist. On the last Sabbath morning, he made an avowal of his sentiments to his congregation. The friends of universal grace and salvation cannot but be thankful for this valuable acquisition to the number of those who proclaim eternal life sure in Christ Jesus for all mankind. Mr. Balfour is the learned author of the *Letters to Prof. Stuart*, which appeared sometime since in the 'Universalist Magazine,' signed 'An Inquirer After Truth.'"

The little congregation at Washington Hall dispersed, and the place has never since been used, we think, for the purpose of public wor-

ship. Some of the members followed their late pastor to the Universalist meeting-house, where he delivered lecture after lecture, in defence of his new opinions. He found himself at once in a new field of duty and labor.

CHAP. VI.

Mr. Balfour's First Publication.

After Mr. Balfour had avowed himself as a Universalist, and as the author of the letters to Prof. Stuart, the Universalists of his own town (prominent among whom was Dr. A. R. Thompson) expressed a very strong desire that he would deliver a course of lectures in the Universalist church. This he did not decline to do. They believed that he possessed the learning and talents, the independence of mind and freedom from prejudice so necessary to an impartial investigation of the great subjects to which he had given his attention; and many of his religious opponents did him the justice to say he was not a rash man, but one who proceeded with caution, who never received anything as divine truth until he had sufficiently and prayerfully considered it, and was convinced it was such. The errors of his early days he did not receive from examination, but from his edueation, at home, and at the kirk,

His course of Sermons in Charlestown.

and by the influence of public opinion all around him. Much of this he had to unlearn; he gave up those doctrines one after the other, as he found them to be false. He became a Universalist because he could not resist the powerful influence of that doctrine. All this the Universalists of Charlestown knew; and they wished to give him an opportunity to utter his opinions, before the public, and in a place where all who wished to hear could gain access. Accordingly, he gave a course of sermons in the church referred to, which attracted much attention. They embraced a Scriptural view of the meaning of the four words translated *hell*, viz., *Sheol*, *Hades*, *Tartarus* and *Gehenna*. Mr. Balfour had fully satisfied himself in writing his Letters to Prof. Stuart, that the doctrine of the salvation of all mankind was a doctrine of the divine word, but there was a class of texts which *seeemed* to oppose that doctrine. These it was his duty to examine, and it was the result of that examination which he proposed to lay before the citizens of Charlestown.

Effects of the Sermons.

It is scarcely possible for any in this day, who did not live at that time, and participate in the soul-stirring events, to realize the satisfaction afforded to those who listened to

Mr. Balfour on the occasions referred to. The Universalists of this country, it is true, had come to the same general conclusions arrived at by him, even before he was known to them; but he treated the Scriptures with a breadth of thought and a scope of investigation rarely known among them before. He entered into a faithful and critical analysis of the Scriptures, classifying all the passages in which the word hell occurs; and avowed it his full conviction, after the most thorough examination that it was in his power to bestow upon the subject, that *hell*, in the original Scriptural sense of the word, did not signify a place or state of endless misery, nor even of a limited punishment after the present life. Such was the effect of this course of sermons, that Mr. Balfour was urged, very earnestly, to permit the publication of his inquiries concerning the true import of the word *hell*, as used by the Old and New Testament writers. These are the facts which gave rise to his, so called, *first* inquiry.

Import of the words rendered hell.

In July, 1823, came out the prospectus for the publishment of the inquiry, entitled "An Inquiry into the Scriptural import of the words SHEOL, HADES, TARTARUS and GEHENNA, all translated HELL in the common English version." Mr. Balfour said—

"The principal object of the author has been to ascertain by an examination of all the passages in which these words occur, whether the inspired writers used any of them to express a place of endless misery for the wicked. Though it is generally allowed that the three first are not so used, yet, as some of the texts in which these words occur, are still quoted in proof of this doctrine, such texts are considered.

"As it is universally contended that the word *Gehenna* is always used by the sacred writers to signify such a place of misery, all the texts in which it occurs are particularly examined. This investigation of the above words, as to their Scripture usage, has ended in the conviction that, originally, no such idea was attached to them. It was undertaken merely for the author's own satisfaction upon this deeply interesting subject to the human race; but having delivered what he had written in a series of discourses, at the request of many who heard them, they are now submitted for publication."

Outline of the work.

The author pursued this object with great faithfulness; and the plan of the work undoubtedly was suggested to him by the course which his mind had taken in the investigation. It was as follows:

CHAP. I.—*Sheol, Hades and Tartarus.*

Sec. 1st. All the passages of Scripture considered in which Sheol occurs, translated pit, grave and hell, in the common version.

Sec. 2d. All the passages in which Hades occurs, translated grave, and hell, in the common version, considered.

Sec. 3d. 2 Peter: 2, 4, considered. This is the only place in which Tartarosas is used and is translated hell in the common version.

CHAP. II.—*Gehenna.*

Sec. 1st. Remarks on Dr. Campbell's views of Gehenna, which is uniformly rendered hell in the common version.

Sec. 2d. A number of facts stated which are not easily accounted for, if by Gehenna, the sacred writers meant a place of endless misery.

Sec. 3d. All the passages in which Gehenna occurs, considered.

Sec. 4th. Additional facts stated, proving that Gehenna was not used by the sacred writers to express a place of endless misery.

Sec. 5th. The argument arising from the authority of the Targums and the Apocrapha, in favor of endless misery, considered.

Sec. 6th. Objections answered.

Sec. 7th. Concluding remarks.

It sets aside the doctrine of future punishment.

The work came out in February, 1824, an octavo of 448 pages, and followed this general plan. Mr. Balfour's inquiries into the Scriptural import of the words rendered hell, had led him, not only to reject the doctrine of endless punishment, but the doctrine of punishment altogether, so far as it related to the future life. There were Universalists who took the same ground with Mr. Balfour in this respect, especially Rev. Hosea Ballou, of Boston, and that very large class of Universalists who sympathized with him in opinion on this point. But the earlier Universalists, and indeed some at the time of which we are treating, held that

although *hell* was not a place of *endless* misery, yet it was a place of a purgatorial punishment after death. When Mr. Balfour first avowed himself to be a Universalist, there was a somewhat lively interest to know on which side of this question of future limited punishment he would take ground. But with his wonted frankness he dispelled, in the very first paragraph of his "Introduction," all doubt on this point.

"The simple object of the author, in this Inquiry, is, to examine the foundation on which the doctrine of endless misery is built. This doctrine rests on the *fact* or the *falsehood* that a place called *hell*, in a future state, is prepared for the punishment of the wicked. In speaking, and preaching, and writing on the subject, this is always presumed as true. It is taken for granted as indisputable. Most Universalists have conceded this to their opponents, and have contended not against the existence of such a place of misery, but against the endless duration of its punishment. All the principal writers on both sides of this question proceed on this ground, that there is a place of future punishment, and that the name of it is *hell*. Winchester, Murray, Chauncey, Huntington and others, all admit that hell is a place of future punishment. Edwards, Strong, and others who opposed them, had no occasion to prove this, but only to show that it was to be endless in its duration. This Inquiry is principally for the purpose of investigating, if what has been taken for granted by the one party, and conceded by the other, is a doctrine taught in Scripture. If the views I have advanced be false, it still leaves the question between Universalists and their opponents undisturbed. If they are found upon examination to

be true, all dispute about *endless misery in hell* must of course cease, for if no such place exists, [in the future state] why dispute about the endless duration of its punishment?"

Examination as to Sheol.

The word Sheol, as Mr. Balfour showed, occurred in the Old Testament in sixty-four instances. In thirty-two of these, it is rendered in the common version, *pit* and *grave*, and in thirty-two, *hell*. Mr. Balfour examined every passage by itself, and having done this, he came to the following conclusion:

"1st. The word translated everlasting, eternal, forever, is never connected with Sheol or hell by any of the Old Testament writers. If they indeed believed that this was a place of punishment for the wicked, and that it was endless in its duration, it is somewhat surprising that this should be the case. Every one knows that these words are very often used there, but not in a single instance do the inspired writers in any way use them, when speaking of Sheol, or hell. So far from this, we have seen that in some of the texts, it is said, hell is to be destroyed. We may then make an appeal to every candid mind, and ask, if Sheol or hell in the Old Testament refers to a place of eternal misery, how are we to account for this? The fact is certain. To account for it, I leave to those who believe this doctrine. We read, to be sure, in books, and we have heard it also in sermons, of an *eternal hell*, but such language is not found once in all the book of God, nor did it ever drop from the lips of any inspired writer.

"2d. Another fact equally certain, is, that not only are the words eternal, everlasting, or forever, omitted in speaking of Sheol, or hell, but this place is not

spoken about, as a place of misery, at all. Whether Sheol is translated pit, grave, or hell, in not one of the passages, is it described as a place of misery or punishment for the wicked, or for any one else. Before there need be any dispute, whether the punishment in this place is to be of eternal duration, we have got first to prove that it *is* a place of punishment. But as this place is Sheol and not Gehenna, I pass this over.

"3d. But so far from its being a place of misery, or eternal in its duration, it is also a fact, that it is described as a place of insensibility and ignorance. We are told that there is "no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave, or Sheol, whither thou goest." Eccles. ix: 10. Besides, Hezekiah, we have seen, said Isaiah, xxxviii: 18—"the grave cannot praise thee; death cannot celebrate thee; they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth." I ask, could those persons have spoken in this manner, if they believed that Sheol or hell was a place of punishment? Yea, I ask, could they in truth have spoken so, if their ideas about Sheol were the same as Christians are about hell? we think this is impossible."

Mr. Balfour also showed, that the habits of speech of believers in endless misery in our day are altogether different from the language of the Old Testament writers on the subject of punishment, of salvation, and of the state of the departed. But to understand all that is said on this subject, his Inquiry must be read.

Examination as to Hades.

Mr. Balfour showed, that the word *Hades* occurred eleven times in the

New Testament, in ten of which it is translated *hell*, and in one, viz., 1 Cor. xv: 55, *grave*. He showed that this word answered precisely to the *Sheol* of the Old Testament. If the former did not signify a place of misery in the future state, so neither did the latter. Mr. Balfour contended that this word originally had no reference to a place of future torment. The account of the rich man in Luke xvi., 23, he contended is a parabolic representation. He admitted that our Lord might here allude to what he called the heathen notion of punishment after death, but not to recognize this notion as truth, any more than he recognized the god mammon, when he said, "ye cannot serve God and mammon;" or Paul the doctrine of witchcraft, when he said, "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you;" or any more than we, when we say, such an one has got St. Anthony's fire, another St. Vitu's dance, recognize the influence of these saints in producing these disorders. He contended that the Jews got their notion of future punishment from the heathen, in proof of which he adduced a luminous quotation from Dr. Campbell, in the third section of this chapter. After considering all the passages in which *Hades* occurs, Mr. Balfour said, "These are all the passages in which

the New Testament writers use the word *Hades*, and which is once translated grave, and ten times hell in the common version. We think all must admit that it is never used to express a place of endless misery; and some evidence has been given that it is never used to express a place of punishment of any kind."

In regard to the use of the word *Hades* in the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, Mr. Balfour further showed, that the apostles could *not* have understood the Saviour as teaching the doctrine of future punishment, for not one of them ever afterward spoke of *Hades* as a place, or state, of future punishment, a fact which is altogether unaccountable on the supposition that Jesus intended to signify such a state by the use of that word. Let this great fact be well remembered.

In concluding his remarks on *Hades* Mr. Balfour says,—

"1st. It will not be disputed by any man, that what the Hebrew writers of the Old Testament expressed by the word Sheol, the Greeks expressed by the word Hades. Both words appear to have been used to express the grave or state of the dead.

"2d. But observe, that the heathen Greeks seem not only to have attached similar ideas to the word Hades, as the Hebrew writers did to the word Sheol, but also the additional idea, that in Hades persons

were punished or rewarded, according to their merits or demerits in the present world. This was their own addition; for no such idea seems to be conveyed in all the Old Testament, by the word Sheol. The evidence of this adduced above, we think will be allowed conclusive.

"If the Jews did not imbibe the idea, that Hades was a place of punishment, from the heathen, let it be shown from what source the Jews derived this information. They attached no such idea to the word Sheol, nor does the Old Testament contain such information. The doctrine must either be from heaven or of men. I have attempted to prove that it is not from heaven. It becomes those who believe it, to show that it is not of men, or cease from believing it, and from quoting the texts in which Sheol and Hades occur, in proof of it. The very circumstance, that only Hades, and not Sheol, is represented as a place of torment, shows in part, that this doctrine is of heathen origin. Hades is a Greek word; and it is well known that Greek was the language of the heathen, and Hebrew that of the Jews.

* * * * * * * *

"3d. Since neither Sheol nor Hades, nor even the word hell, in English, originally signified a place of endless misery, we have a few questions to put to those who believe in this doctrine. We ask, then, is it not a perversion of the divine oracles, to quote any of the texts in which Sheol or Hades occurs, to prove it? It is well known that such texts are often quoted for this purpose. But I ask again, is it not a very great imposition upon the ignorant, to quote such texts in proof of this doctrine? The simple, honest-hearted English reader of his Bible, sees the word hell often used by the sacred writers. He has been taught from a child, that hell means a place of endless misery for the wicked. Every book he reads, every sermon he hears, all tend to deepen his early

impressions, and confirm him in this opinion. Those who know better, are not much disposed to undeceive him about such mistaken views and wrong impressions. On the one hand, they are perhaps deterred from it by a false fear of disturbing public opinion, and on the other, by reluctance to encounter the odium of the Christian public, in being looked on as heretics. Select the most celebrated preacher you can find, and let him frankly and fully tell his audience, that neither Sheol, nor Hades, nor even our word hell, did, originally, mean a place of endless misery, and his celebrity is at an end. He would from that moment be considered as an heretic, and his former admirers would now be his most warm opposers. But I ask again, and I solemnly put it to every man's conscience, who professes to fear God,—ought not men to be honestly and plainly told the truth about this, let the consequences be what they may? Are we at liberty to pervert the Scriptures in favor of any sect, or system in the world?

* * * * * * * *

"4th. The translators of our common English version appear to have had more correct ideas about Sheol, Hades, or hell, than most people who read their translation. They certainly were at some pains to guard us against attaching to the word hell the idea of a place of endless misery. In many places where they render Sheol and Hades by the word hell, they have put grave in the margin. Besides, let it be remembered that the word hell originally signified the same as Sheol and Hades. It was then the very best word they could use in rendering these two words. If men have affixed a different sense to the word hell, the translators are not to blame.

* * * * * * * *

"5th. Several very serious evils arise from understanding Sheol or Hades to mean a place of endless misery. In the first place, it is a perversion of those

texts in which these words occur. This perversion of them leads to a misunderstanding of many others. By this means, the knowledge such texts convey, is not only in some degree lost, but our knowledge of the word of God is greatly retarded, and our minds are perplexed and embarrassed on other connected subjects. Every text of Scripture misunderstood, lays a foundation for a misunderstanding of others; and thus error is not only rendered perpetual, but progressive.

"But this is not all. Understanding Sheol and Hades to mean a place of endless misery, is perverting God's word to caricature himself. It is putting our own sense on his words, to make him say things against ourselves which he never intended. It is giving a false color to the language of the Bible, that we may support the false views we entertain of his character, and his dealings with the children of men.

"6th. I may just add about Hades what was noticed about Sheol, that we never find the words eternal, everlasting, or forever, used in connexion with it, or concerning it. We never read of an everlasting or eternal Hades or hell, or that men are to be punished in it forever. Nothing like this is to be found in Scripture. Such epithets added to the word hell, found in books and sermons, are among the improvements in divinity which man's wisdom teacheth. The word *hell* is first perverted from its original signification, and then the word *eternal* is added to it, to make the punishment of endless duration."

Examination as to Tartarus.

The word ***Tartarus*** occurs but once in the Bible, 2 Peter ii: 4. Mr. Balfour explained this passage on the same principle on which he interpreted the use of *Hades* by our Lord in the parable of the Rich Man.

It was a reference by Peter to a heathen notion by way of illustration, but with no intent of recognizing it as truth. Mr. B. concluded this section by showing the following results:

"1st. The doctrine of punishment in Tartarus seems to have originated with legislators, for the purpose of restraining the passions of the multitude, and to alarm 'them on all sides with the most frightful representations.' The Persians, Chaldeans, Egyptians and Greeks, all introduced punishment after death. The Jewish nation is an exception. Some deistical writers have even blamed Moses as a legislator for not introducing eternal punishment into his code of laws, as a curb on men against licentiousness. It is generally allowed that the punishments threatened in the Old Testament are of a temporal nature.

"2d. From the above quotation, it appears that though punishment after death in Tartarus was believed by the heathen generally, yet the better informed among them did not believe '*in the fables of hell*,' but turned them into ridicule. Juvenal took no part in those opinions of the vulgar; and Virgil says—'it was the province of philosophy alone to shake off the yoke of custom, riveted by education.' Is it not then strange, that a doctrine which was invented by heathens, and treated with contempt by their own wisest men, should be a fundamental article in the faith of christians? How is this to be accounted for?

"3d. I may just add, that when the heathen were made converts to the Christian faith, all allow that many of their previous notions were soon incorporated with it. This, together with the erroneous views held by the Jewish converts, laid a foundation for such a corruption of Christianity, which, if it were not attested by evidence indisputable, could not be believed. That punishment in Hades, or Tartarus, af-

ter death, is but a part of this corruption of Christianity derived from the heathen, at least deserves to be seriously considered. The evidence we have adduced, proving that it is, we submit to the reader's judgment.

"To conclude this chapter. We have shown, that neither Sheol, Hades, nor Tartarus, is ever used by the sacred writers to signify a place of endless misery for the wicked. This was all we were bound to do in opposing the common opinion on this subject. But we have also shown that this opinion originated with the heathen, and that the Jews learned it from them. To invalidate the evidence which has been produced, the very reverse must be proved."

Examination as to Gehenna.

The word *Gehenna* had been relied on, by learned theologians, as the word by which they were to prove the doctrine of endless misery. If they gave up this word, all support of the doctrine referred to was gone. Here they had made their last stand; and it was not to be supposed they were to be driven from this point, without the greatest effort to sustain themselves which they were capable of making. Mr. Balfour knew this. He knew, therefore, that his fullest attention must be given to the Scriptural use of the word *Gehenna*. He says,—

"We have now arrived at a part of this Inquiry, which requires the utmost attention. The New Testament is considered as clearly and decidedly teaching the doctrine of *endless misery* to all the wicked, and

Gehenna is the place in which they are said to suffer it. The *truth* or *falsehood* of this doctrine is then at issue upon the decision of the question—*What is the Scripture meaning and usage of the word Gehenna?*"

He devotes one section to reviewing the remarks of Dr. Campbell on the word *Gehenna*, in which he shows that the learned author had acknowledged that the corresponding Hebrew terms in the Old Testament signified merely temporal punishment; but that the word *Gehenna* had come, in our Saviour's time, to signify a place of endless punishment. The latter position Mr. Balfour disputes, and, in the Sequel, renders it utterly untenable.

Important facts as to Gehenna.

He gives a series of facts to show that *Gehenna* is not used by the New Testament writers to signify a place of future punishment.

"1st. Then, let it be kept in remembrance, that neither Gehenna nor any other word is used in the Old Testament to express a place of endless misery for the wicked. This we presume will be admitted as established from the preceding part of our examination. It is evident from chap. i. that Sheol, Hades, and Tartarus, have no such meaning.

* * * * * * * *

"2d. The word Gehenna occurs just twelves times in the New Testament, and is always translated *hell* in our English version. The following are all the places where this word is found: Matt. v: 22, 29, 30, and xviii: 9, Mark ix: 43, 47; Luke xii: 5;

Matt. x : 28, and xxiii : 15, 33 ; James iii : 6. I only refer to these texts now, because they shall all be particularly considered afterwards. The fact that this word is only found twelve times in the New Testament, I notice for the following reasons :

" It is contended by Dr. Campbell, and I believe is universally admitted, that Gehenna is the only word which signifies the place of endless punishment for the wicked. But do most Christians know that the word hell, so much talked of and preached about, is only found twelve times in the Scriptures? But a little reflection may convince any one that, properly speaking, it was not used originally so often as twelve times. It occurs eleven times in the gospels written by Matthew, Mark and Luke, and by comparing the places, it is easily seen, that these historians only relate some of the same discourses, in which our Lord used this word. Though it occurs then eleven times in the three histories given us by those evangelists, it is plain it was not so often used by him when he uttered his discourses. Viewing the matter in this light, and surely it is the true one, few words of such importance occur so seldom in the New Testament as the word Gehenna.

* * * * * * * *

" 3d. Another fact is, that the word Gehenna, or hell, is used by our Lord, and by James, but by no other person in the New Testament. This fact, every person who can read English, may satisfy himself about in the course of a few minutes, by reading all the texts referred to above where the word Gehenna is found. Is it not, then, somewhat surprising, that it should only be used twelve times in the New Testament, and still more surprising, that our Lord and James should be the only persons who say anything about it?

* * * * * * * *

" 4th. Another fact deserving our attention, is, that

all that is said about Gehenna in the way of threatening, or in any other shape, was spoken to *Jews*. *Jews*, and *they only*, were the persons addressed, when speaking of Gehenna. It is not once named to the Gentiles in all the New Testament, nor are any of them ever threatened with such a punishment. This fact is indisputable. The evidence of its truth does not depend on a tedious, intricate process of reasoning, which few persons could go through and decide about. All that any one has to do is to read all the texts referred to, in which Gehenna occurs, in connexion with their contexts, and he must be satisfied of the correctness of my statement.

* * * * * * * *

"5th. Another very important fact to be noticed, is, that the chief part of all that our Lord said about Gehenna, was spoken to his disciples. Out of twelve times in which Gehenna or hell is mentioned in the New Testament, in only two instances is a word said about it to the unbelieving part of the Jewish nation. In nine of those places our Lord was evidently addressing his disciples, and in the other place where Gehenna is mentioned, James was addressing believing Jews of the twelve tribes, who were scattered abroad. This fact is also so notorious that the texts where the word Gehenna occurs, need only to be consulted, to satisfy any one of its truth. It is not more certain that this word occurs just twelve times in the New Testament, than it is certainly used ten times in speaking to the disciples, and only twice to the unbelieving Jews.

* * * * * * * *

"6th. But another fact which deserves some notice, is, that in all the places where Gehenna or hell is mentioned, the persons addressed are supposed to be acquainted with its meaning. No explanation is asked, and none is given, nor is it thought, either by speaker or hearers, to be necessary. The Jews, who

are always the persons addressed, appear to have understood what our Lord meant by the punishment or damnation of Gehenna, as well as what was meant by stoning to death. The very first time it is mentioned, Matt. v. 22, the disciples had no more occasion to ask our Lord what he meant by Gehenna, than what he meant by the judgment and council. If this be true, and we think it will not be disputed, a very important question arises,—how came they to understand that Gehenna meant a place of eternal punishment for all the wicked? From what source did they derive their information concerning this? I cannot conceive of any sources from whence they could possibly derive this information, unless from one or other of the following:

"1st. From *immediate inspiration*. No evidence that this was the case can be produceed, nor is it likely to be asserted by any person who has considered the subject.

"2d. The *preaching of John the Baptist*. But as John never said a word about Gehenna to his hearers, this cannot be contended for by any one.

"3d. Did they then derive their information from the *instructions* and *explanations of the Saviour?* Neither can this be contended for by any one who has read the four gospels. Our Lord on no one occasion ever gave any such explanation of Gehenna. No man will say he ever did.

"4th. Did they derive their information from *the Old Testament Scriptures* which they had in their hands? This they could not do, for we have seen above, that it did not contain much information. They could not learn a doctrine from it, which Dr. Campbell and others declare it did not teach. We have seen what the Old Testatament teaches about Gehenna, but not a word does it say that it means a place of future eternal misery for the wicked.

"5th. The only other source from whence they

could learn that Gehenna meant a place of endless punishment for the wicked, was the writings of *fallible, uninspired men*. Accordingly, no other alternative was left Dr. Campbell but to say, that 'Gehenna, in process of time, came to be used in this sense, and at length came to be confined to it.' Here, then is the way in which it is said Gehenna came to have the sense which is now commonly given it."

All the passages considered.

After stating these very important facts, Mr. Balfour proceeds to consider every passage in the New Testament in which the word Gehenna occurs. But we must refer to the work itself for what he says on this point. Suffice it to remark, that he clearly, fully, and unquestionably shows, that the word is not, in a single instance, used by the sacred writers to signify a place of punishment in the future state. He considers every passage in connexion with its context, and with the circumstances under which it was spoken, and comes to the conclusion above named without a solitary doubt being upon his mind. There is a fund of Scriptural criticism in this part of the work, which ought never to be lost. Let successive authors and preachers, who love the Bible in its true sense, keep these very important explanations, collations, reasonings and conclusions, before the people. They must not be lost, and thank God they cannot be. They are be-

fore the world; and the light of them can no more be extinguished than the light of the sun. To Mr. Balfour, more than to any other man, must be ascribed the credit of bringing out and setting in order these arguments and interpretations.

Additional facts.

Having completed the examination of all the texts, Mr. Balfour proceeds to give additional facts, showing that the word *Gehenna* was not used by the sacred writers to denote a place of punishment in the future state. We give merely an outline of these facts, referring the reader to the work itself for the full argument.

"1st. If Gehenna means a place of endless misery for the wicked, it is a fact that the apostles never preached it, either to *Jews* or *Gentiles*. The history of the Acts of the apostles contains an account of their preaching for thirty years, but not once is the subject of *hell* or *Gehenna torments* mentioned by them. They were commanded to preach the gospel to every creature, and they did so, but to no creature under heaven did they ever preach this doctrine. No living being did they ever threaten with such a punishment. They addressed the worst of characters, but to none of them did they ever say, 'how can ye escape the damnation of Gehenna?'

* * * * * * * *

"2d. Another fact is, that the salvation revealed by the gospel, is never spoken of as a salvation from hell or endless misery. No such salvation was ever promised or predicted in the Old Testament, and no

such salvation was ever preached by Christ, or his apostles. Our Lord received the name Jesus, because he should *save his people from their sins.* But I do not find that he received this name, or any other, because he should save them from *hell* Our Lord and his apostles, in their preaching, proposed by it to turn men from darkness to light: from the power of satan unto God; from idols to serve the living God; from the course of this world; and from all sin to holiness; but where do we ever read of their proposing to save them from hell? No such salvation was preached by our Lord. In all the above texts, where he speaks of hell, he was not preaching the gospel, but addressing the Jews about the temporal calamities coming on them as a people. In no instance did he ever exhort men to bring forth fruits worthy of repentance, because they were exposed to hell torments in a future state. So far from this, in nine instances out of eleven, where Gehenna is used by him, he was addressing his disciples. It is of no use to observe, that his apostles never made use of the punishment of hell to induce men to repentance, for they do not once name it in all their writings. James is the only exception, who mentions hell once, and that only in a figurative sense. Nothing is said in our Lord's commission to his apostles about hell, and as little is said of it by them in their execution of it. To Jew and Gentile, bond and free, they are all silent about it. It is never mentioned by them to any persons, on any occasion, or in any connexion, or on any subject.

* * * * * * * *

"3d. Supposing that hell is a place of endless misery for the wicked, it will not be an easy matter to vindicate either the character of our Lord or of his apostles.

It will not be easy to vindicate their character for *fidelity to God*, or to *the souls of men.* It is certain our Lord was faithful to him who appointed him.

The apostles were also faithful, in declaring the whole counsel of God. But can all this be true, if they knew that hell was a place of eternal misery, and that all the world stood exposed to it, yet said nothing to them about it? It is true the Saviour mentions hell nine times to his disciples, and twice to the unbelieving Jews, but we have seen that he did not refer to such a place of misery. Neither he nor his apostles ever used the word in speaking to the Gentiles. Now I ask, is this like being faithful? Is this being half so faithful as most preachers are in our day? We think every candid man must say no; it is rather being very unfaithful, if they indeed believed this doctrine as it is commonly received among us. Let it then be accounted for, how preaching hell as a place of endless misery now is so much a duty, since it was not so accounted by the apostles, nor even by our Lord himself.

* * * * * * * *

"4th. The Old Testatment is often quoted in the New, but it is an indisputable fact, that though quoted by our Lord when speaking about hell, or Gehenna, it is not quoted to show that hell was a place of eternal misery, but in reference to temporal punishment. Indeed, it was impossible for our Lord or his apostles to quote the Old Testament to prove that hell was such a place of misery; for it is acknowledged by Dr. Campbell and others, that in this sense Gehenna or hell does not occur there. They could not make a quotation in proof of this from it, for it did not afford them anything to quote. Well, permit me to ask, why our Lord did quote the Old Testament, and quoted it on the very texts in which hell or Gehenna is spoken of? In Mark ix. considered above, our Lord expressly quotes a passage from Isaiah, when speaking concerning hell to his disciples. In other places he seems to allude to others. Had our Lord then meant to use Gehenna or hell in a different sense from

that in the Old Testament, was it not calculated to mislead his hearers thus to quote it?

* * * * * * * *

"5th. If there be a place of endless misery for the wicked, is it not another remarkable fact that the Hebrew, Greek, and English languages originally had no name for this place? We have seen from Dr. Campbell, that Gehenna does not occur in this sense in the Old Testament; that it is not a Greek word; that it is not found in the Septuagint, nor in the Grecian classics. It is originally 'a compound of the two Hebrew words *gia enm*, *ge hinnom*, the valley of Hinnom, a place near Jerusalem, of which we hear first in the book of Joshua xv. 8.' Let us also see what he says about our English word hell. Speaking of Hades, in his sixth dissertation, he says: 'To this the word hell in its primitive signification perfectly corresponded. For, at first it denoted only what was secret or concealed. This word is found with little variation of form, and precisely in the same meaning, in all the Teutonic dialects. But though our word hell, in its original signification, was more adapted to express the sense of Hades than of Gehenna, it is not so now. When we speak as Christians, we always express by it the place of the punishment of the wicked after the general judgment, as opposed to heaven, the place of the reward of the righteous.' It is very evident from this, that the word hell did not originally signify a place of endless misery.

* * * * * * * *

"It is then a very plain case, that for this place of endless misery, the Hebrew, Greek and English languages did not originally furnish a name. We have then to ask, had the inspired writers any idea of such a place of misery? If they had, it is evident they wanted a name for it to express it to others. If they have not expressed it by any word to others, how does

any man know that they entertained such an idea? We have seen persons use words to which they had no distinct ideas. And we have also seen persons having ideas, which they could not very easily express in appropriate language to others. But we believe it is a singular case, that the Bible is said to reveal a place of endless misery, yet the inspired writers had no name for it. It will not do to say,—did not our Lord call it Gehenna, and did not our translators call it hell? No; this will never do; for we have seen that the word Gehenna is borrowed from the Old Testament, yet this is not its sense there. And we have seen from an examination of all the passages where it occurs in the New, that our Lord did not by Gehenna mean a place of endless misery. Yea, we have seen that it is conceded by those who believed Gehenna to mean a place of endless misery, that the word hell, in its original signification, had no such meaning. It is surely then a very proper question to be asked, who changed the words Gehenna and hell from their original signification to mean a place of endless misery? We shall see in the next section that the writers of the Targums and the apocrypha are appealed to for this change, that this change was gradually produced, and finally Gehenna was used exclusively to mean such a place of misery. Who gave this new sense to the word hell, or whether its change of sense was gradual or sudden, I can afford no information. It is enough for us to know that this was not its original signification; and this fact is attested by Dr. Campbell, Parkhurst and others, all firm believers in the doctrine of hell torments.

* * * * * * * *

"6th. Another fact deserving our consideration, is, that Christians, when they speak of hell, adopt the phraseology used about Sheol and Hades, rather than Gehenna, though it is contended that Gehenna is the word which signifies hell, or the place of endless mis-

ery. I shall explain what I mean. For example, it is evident upon an inspection of the passages in which Sheol, Hades and Gehenna occur, that Gehenna, for depth, is never contrasted with heaven for height, like Sheol and Hades. Nor do we read of persons going down to Gehenna, of the depths of Gehenna, or of the lowest Gehenna. Neither do we read of the gates of Gehenna, nor of the pains of Gehenna. All these things are said of Sheol and Hades, as we have seen in a former part of this Inquiry. Besides, no representations are given of Gehenna as of Sheol and Hades, as if all the dead or even the wicked were there.

* * * * * * * *

"7th. Another fact deserving some notice, is, that the punishment of hell or Gehenna is never once spoken of as a punishment of the spirit, separate from the body in an intermediate state, nor as a punishment for both body and spirit, after the resurrection of the dead.

* * * * * * * *

"8th. Closely connected with the last fact is another, that the learned seem to believe in two places of future punishment, and the common people only in one. Dr. Campbell, we have seen, declares that Gehenna is the place of eternal punishment for all the wicked. He also thinks that Hades is an intermediate punishment until the resurrection; but that this place is then to be destroyed. If it be true, then, that Hades is one place of punishment, and Gehenna another, it is beyond all doubt that there are two places of future punishment, the one temporary, and the other after the resurrection of the dead.

* * * * * * * *

"9th. Another fact is, that though we read of the sea, death and Hades, delivering up the dead which are in them, yet we never read of Gehenna's delivering up anything dead or alive. Now let us suppose that at death the body goes to Hades, the grave, or

state of the dead, and the spirit goes to Gehenna or hell, to suffer punishment until the resurrection of the body. If this commonly received doctrine be true, is it not as rational to think that we should read in Scripture of Gehenna or hell's delivering up the spirits of the wicked at the resurrection, as that Hades or the grave should deliver up their bodies? In order to a reunion at this period, it is just as necessary that the spirits should come forth from the one place, as their bodies from the other. But nothing like this is to be found in the Bible.

* * * * * * * *

"10th. Another important fact deserving our notice, is, that none of the original words translated in the common version, eternal, everlasting and forever, are once connected with Gehenna, or hell.. Not an instance can be found where we read of an everlasting Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, or of an *everlasting Gehenna, or hell.* No; though we often hear preachers, in our day, speak of an erernal hell, such language never was used by any inspired writer. The phrase 'everlasting fire' occurs in the Bible, and this has been shown before to be the same as 'everlasting punishment,' and the 'fire that never shall be quenched.' But we have seen. that none of these expressions refer to a place in a future state called Gehenna, or hell; or that the punishment referred to is endless in its duration. But an *eternal hell* is often heard of from the pulpit, and perhaps many believe it to be a Scripture expression.

* * * * * * * *

"11th. In the common language of most Christians, you find heaven as the place of blessedness for the righteous, spoken of in contrast with Gehenna or hell, the place of endless misery for the wicked. Whatever they say about the former, they have a counterpart in speaking of the latter. But when we look into the Bible, we do not find such a counterpart.

I shall illustrate what I mean by an example or two. In the Bible we find persons expressing their hopes of going to heaven; but do we ever read of one expressing his fears of going to Gehenna or hell? We indeed find persons speaking familiarly of Sheol and Hades, and expressing both their fears and feelings in regard to this place; but do we ever read of one who expresses his fears or feelings about going to Gehenna? No; not an instance of this is found in Scripture."

Such are the important facts, which in Mr. Balfour's mind formed an irresistible mass of evidence to show, that Gehenna was not used by Christ, or his servant James, (for these are the only persons who ever used the word, so far as we can learn from the New Testament,) to signify a place of future punishment. In the first place, Mr. Balfour gave a class of facts somewhat preliminary in their nature; 2d, he examined every text in which the word *Gehenna* occurs, and showed, beyond all dispute, by a reference to the Old Testament sense of the corresponding Hebrew term, and by a careful examination of the context to each of the twelve passages in the New Testament, that the conclusion above named, in regard to the Scriptural use of the word, is undoubtedly true; and 3d, he corroborated the whole, by another series of very interesting and very important facts. But here he does not leave the matter.

He considered the question whether the Apocrypha or the Targums show that Gehenna was ever used by divine authority to signify a state of future punishment. But behold, said he, the word *Gehenna* does not occur in the Apocrypha at all! As to the Targums, he fully showed that whatever be the sense, in which *Gehenna* is used therein, it cannot affect the question at issue, as no one of the Targums was written early enough to determine in what sense the word *Gehenna* was used in the time of Christ. Even if the Targums, or either of them, had been in existence in the days of our Saviour, whether is the more probable that he would have followed the prophets in *their* sense of Gehenna, or the Jewish Rabbins? The former surely. Did he, in a single case, intimate that he used *Gehenna* in a different sense from that which the corresponding term bore in the Old Testament? But all questions about the sense of the word in the Targums may be dismissed, as there is no proof that either of them was written until sometime after the death of Christ, and of course they would determine nothing in reference to the sense which Christ and his apostles, or the Jews generally, attached to the word *Gehenna* in his day. The preponder-

Apocrypha and Targums examined.

ance of evidence goes to show that the earliest Targums were not written until two or three hundred years after the death of Christ. That the Jews finally came to use the word *Gehenna* to denote a place of future punishment, Mr. Balfour did not deny; but this had not happened in our Lord's day. At that time the Jews knew only the sense attributed to the term *Gehinnom* in the Old Testament. They gained their subsequent views of future punishment by their association with the heathen around them. Such are the great facts brought out by Mr. Balfour in regard to the Scriptural sense of the word *Gehenna.*

Objections answered.

At the conclusion of his work, Mr. Balfour answered the objections which might be urged against his belief of the great doctrine of universal salvation, and his disbelief of the doctrine of punishment after death.*

*Mr. Balfour subsequently said, "When the first edition of the Inquiry was published, the author's attention was entirely directed to the endless duration of future punishment. From his examinations, then, he had strong doubts of limited future punishment. Subsequent investigations have confirmed and increased these doubts, nor has he seen any satisfactory evidence that *limited* any more than *endless* punishment is taught in Scripture. He thinks he has candidly considered all which his brethren have urged in defence of a *limited* future punishment; but the arguments used, and the Scriptures quoted, only

Effect of the Inquiry.

It will be difficult to form a just estimate, in this day, of the effect which the publication of this Inquiry had upon the public mind. There were thousands who believed the whole subject had been exhausted by Mr. Balfour. They thought the whole matter had been settled, that the word hell, as used in the Bible, did in no case signify a place or state of punishment hereafter. The clergy,—the preachers of endless misery,—were evidently thrown into a state of alarm, as to the way in which they should thereafter defend their doctrine of punishment beyond the grave. The Unitarian divines in general remained ominously silent. When questioned on the subject, they intimated that learned men had long known that *the most* which Mr. Balfour had said was true; though they did not seem pleased to have the foundation of the doctrine of future punishment entirely swept away. Those Universalists who believed in future punishment, like Messrs. Turner, Dean, Hudson and others, did not fully participate in the general joy of their brethren on the publication of the work. The so-called Ortho-

---

tend to confirm him in the opinion that the doctrine of *limited* future punishment cannot be supported from the Bible." See Inquiry, 3d edition, p. 5, Boston, 1832.

dox, or Evangelical ranks, resembled a body of men who had been prostrated to the earth by the descent of lightning; and it was for a little time a matter of very interesting excitement, whether they would attempt again to make a defence of their favorite doctrine, so essential to those who propagate their religion by operating on the fears of the ignorant; and if they should, on what new ground they would attempt to build it up.

The attempts made to break down the influence of the Inquiry will be treated of in the next chapter.

CHAP. VII.

Controversy to which the Inquiry gave rise.

The Inquiry had been but a little time before the public, when it was made the subject of animadversion. At first the attacks were quite indirect. They were made in the pulpits to which Mr. Balfour could not gain access, and in public papers which would admit of no replies. Of course, in this kind of warfare, he could not defend himself; in fact, it was altogether a kind of warfare too small, indirect and disingenuous, to satisfy his mind.* He loved honesty, directness and simplicity. Desultory warfare.

The Inquiry had been before the public six or eight months, when some person called on the clergy, through the public Mr. Sabine attacks the Inquiry.

*In 1832 Mr. Balfour said,—"It would be tedious and would occupy more room than we can spare, to notice all the attacks which have been made upon it [the Inquiry] from the pulpit and in the public journals, since its first publication. The instances which have come within the range of our own personal knowledge and observation, have not been few."

journals, either to refute it, or to confess that they were deceiving the people. There was, in Boston, at this time, a clergyman by the name of James Sabine, who was, for aught we know, a virtuous man, but who had lost caste among his Congregationalist brethren. He had had a war with his Society in Essex street, and been driven out of his station there. It was probably a desire to write himself back again into public favor, that led him to attack the Inquiry. He professed to have been roused by the call which had been made upon the clergy; and he came out, therefore, in the public journals and said, that if a suitable meeting house could be obtained, he would refute the Inquiry.* He was a good speaker, as well as a good writer. The doubt for some time was, whether he could obtain a church for his purpose. At length the Methodist Society in Bromfield street, Boston, gave him liberty to deliver his course of lectures in their house. Public notice was accordingly given; but before the day arrived, the committee became alarmed, and revoked the permission. This was principally because they feared they should be called on to open the house for a reply, or be-

*See Columbian Centinel of Sept. Oct. and Nov., 1824.

cause a reply might be made upon the spot. Mr. Sabine, in announcing his disappointment, gave the following significant hint: "This diversion of my plan has been occasioned not by a want of *religion*, as it is professed by too many, but for the want of a little *common honesty*." He attributed the change to some influence out of the committee. When all others failed to aid Mr. S., the Universalist Society in Charlestown came forward, with great liberality, and threw open their doors; and the reply to Mr. Balfour was actually delivered in their meeting house, and in no other place. The Universalists, evidently, were not afraid of free inquiry.

Plan of the attack.

One great trouble with Mr. Sabine from the beginning was, that he did not understand the subject he had attempted to discuss. He did not come up manfully to the task, and meet boldly Mr. Balfour's positions and arguments; but he went off to side issues, and put in a great amount of special pleading. The work was rather an attempt to support future punishment on other grounds, than to refute the arguments of the Inquiry. The so-called reply was comprised in six lectures, of which the titles were as follows:

1. Examination and trial of the ground taken in the Inquiry.
2. Divine government constituted upon the principle of Future Retribution.
3. Retribution threatened to the wicked, a motive to Virtue.
4. Rewards and punishments in a future state, proved from the Direct Testimony of Scripture.
5. Punishment in a future state further considered.
6. Mr. Balfour's system opposed to Divine Authority.*

Did not meet main grounds of Inquiry

Now, the most of the positions taken by Mr. Sabine might be true, and still the real grounds of the Inquiry remain untouched. Never did a book go under an examination, and come out so completely unmarred, as did the Inquiry. It is not our place to say whether Mr. Sabine did or did not sustain his six positions; but even allowing that he sustained them all, excepting the last, he might have done so without affecting at all the ground taken in the Inquiry. But even under his sixth and last position, Mr. Sabine did not attempt to prove directly that the Inquiry was oppcsed to divine authority; but went off to side issues, and sought

*See "Universal Salvation indefensible upon Mr. Balfour's Ground: A Reply to an Inquiry, &c. &c., in a Series of Lectures, delivered in the Universalist Church, Charlestown. By James Sabine, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in the city of Boston. Boston, 1825." 8vo, p. 132.

to make out that point by appealing to other things. He did as little to overthrow Mr. Balfour's book, as the perching of a hawk upon the apex of Bunker Hill Monument would do to unsettle the base.

Dr. Thompson on Mr. Sabine's effort.

At the close of Mr. Sabine's last lecture, Dr. A. R. Thompson, a citizen of Charlestown, of much distinction, then a member of the Universalist Society, ascended the pulpit, and delivered an address to the very crowded auditory. The following extracts will show the character of Mr. Sabine's Lectures, as viewed by those who listened to them:

"My Friends,—The Rev. Mr. Sabine having now closed his lectures, I request the privilege of making a few observations to you on the subject of his labors. The reverend gentleman, of his own free will, offered his services in the public papers, to examine and refute Mr. Balfour's book, provided he might be allowed the use of a pulpit. This religious Society, in the genuine spirit of free inquiry, unanimously offered him their pulpit; and you, my friends, have patiently and candidly attended the discussion. Some of you have read Mr. Balfour's book, but many have attended these lectures who have not read the book. Those of you who have read the book will bear me witness that those who have not, cannot possibly form a correct idea of it from Mr. Sabine's lectures. In justice, therefore, to the cause of truth, to the author of the book, and to those who have not read it, I feel constrained to state explicitly, but briefly, what the pur-

pose and scope of this book are. The object of Mr. Balfour's book, then, from the beginning to the end, is TO SHOW THAT HELL WAS NOT A PLACE OF ENDLESS MISERY, AS HAS BEEN GENERALLY AND LONG BELIEVED. This the author shows incontrovertibly, by a consideration of all the texts where the words rendered hell in our common version occur. He also spent two sections of the book, in stating a number of facts, that the inspired writers did not consider hell as a place of endless misery; nor of any misery in a future state, as has been supposed,—that no prophet in the Old Testament, nor yet our Saviour, nor his apostles in the New Testament, ever used the word hell to express a state of punishment in the future world. He also traced the doctrine of hell, as a place of endless misery, to heathenism as its origin—and adduced some quotations from believers in the doctrine of hell torments to prove it, &c. What, then, has Mr. Sabine done in refuting these things? Did he take up the texts to show that the author of the book had wrested these texts? had perverted them? Has he taken up any of the facts and shown them to be false? Or has he ever told his audience that he believes hell to be a place of endless misery? His work was to answer the book, not to make it; but has he not, in quoting it, altered it, and found constant fault with the author, because he did not write the book to suit him? He quoted but little of the book; (and two whole sections, which contain the great body of material facts, he has not quoted at all, nor even alluded to,) and when he made quotations, he never, until the last lecture, in a single sentence, referred his hearers to the page, that they might read and judge for themselves.

* * * * * * * *

"Having said thus much about Mr. Sabine's attempts against Mr. Balfour's book, we must, in justice to our own feelings, say something of his treat-

ment of our friend the author. Those who have not read Mr. B.'s book, and have no personal knowledge of him, would certainly form a terrible idea of the man, from the portrait of him in Mr. S.'s lectures. Mr. B. is there charged with sophistry, insincerity and falsehoood, with denying all penalty or punishment for sin, with abetting and upholding all infidelity, and all immorality, with first perverting, then denying divine revelation,—with attempting to unhinge and throw down the whole moral system, thus to dethrone the moral Ruler of the universe. Mr. S. allows Mr. B. the best abilities, but then accuses him of the worst designs against the best interests both of God and man, and thus adroitly hangs him up between heaven and earth, as fit for neither. But, my friends, remember, a good cause is never made better by personal abuse, and a bad one is always made worse. As the best possible refutation of everything which can be said against Mr. B.'s book is to read it; so the best possible refutation of every thing that has been said against the man is to know him as we do."*

Mr. Balfour's Reply.

In two or three months after Mr. Sabine's lectures had been delivered, they were published. Mr. Balfour came out, at once, with a second edition of his Inquiry, reduced in size, and brought down to half price; and as soon as it could be prepared, he published his Reply to Mr. Sabine.† He divided it into

*See Universalist Magazine, vol. vi., p. 127. Mr. Sabine, shortly after these Lectures were delivered, left Boston, abandoned his position as a Presbyterian, connected himself with the Episcopal church, and moved into Vermont, where he became the rector of a parish.

†Mr. Balfour was a man of ready utterance, in the

two parts. 1st. A Defence of the Inquiry, and 2d, Mr. Sabine's Proofs of a Future Retribution considered. Mr. Balfour, like many other intelligent men, believed that Mr. Sabine had done little or nothing to break up the ground of the Inquiry. For instance, see the following paragraph:

"Such is a brief outline of the book, which Mr. Sabine undertook to refute, the correctness of which we are confident he will not dispute. The question comes then fairly before us, *What ought Mr. S. to have done to answer this book?* We reply, he ought to have proved that *Hell is a place of endless misery to the wicked.* But has he done this? No, he has not even attempted it. Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon, for the daughters of the uncircumsised will triumph, that he does not *pretend* to advocate *that hell is a place of endless misery.* As to hell being *a place*, he denies it; and as to the endless duration of its punishment, he abandons its defence. What the armies of the living God will think and say of this, it is not for me to say. But we will say, that what he remarks concerning the departure of certain men in this region from Orthodox principles, comes with a bad grace from him, when he strikes the Orthodox flag of endless misery to half mast in his first onset with such an uncircumsised Philistine." Pp. 11, 12.

---

pulpit, but was not what the world would term an orator. He judged it best, therefore, and very wisely we think, to reply to Mr. Sabine from the press, and not from the pulpit. See "A Reply to Mr. Sabine's Lectures on the Inquiry, &c., in two parts. 1st. A Defence of the Inquiry. 2d. His proofs of a Future Retribution considered. By Walter Balfour." Boston, 1825. 8vo, p. 136.

In the second part of his book, which is by far the greater part of it, Mr. Balfour considers at length all Mr. Sabine's alleged proofs of the doctrine of future retribution. Mr. B.'s object in the "Inquiry" was to show that neither *Sheol*, *Hades*, *Tartarus* or *Gehenna* denoted a place of endless misery. It came out, two or three times in the course of the work, that the author saw no proof of a future punishment at all; but this was not an integral part of his system; the system was complete, in its original design, without that inception. But Mr. Sabine showed a very strong, and in fact an uncontrollable desire to run off to side issues. Had he succeeded in proving the doctrine of *endless* misery, he would have settled the whole question as to punishment hereafter; but even if he had proved the doctrine of limited future punishment, he would still have left the main question untouched. He might well therefore have given his whole attention to the doctrine of endless punishment. But as he did not see fit, for certain reasons, to do so, Mr. Balfour saw fit to follow him whithersoever he led; and hence he entitled the second part of his reply, "Mr. Sabine's proofs of a Future Retribution considered." And faithfully did he consid-

Alleged proofs of Future Retribution considered.

er them. He did not leave one stone upon another, that was not thrown down. At the close, he proposed to Mr. Sabine a further discussion of the subject, laying down the principles on which he thought it should be conducted; but Mr. Sabine made no further efforts.

Other labors of Mr Balfour.

Soon after the publication of the "Inquiry," Mr. Balfour sent several very important articles to the "Universalist Magazine" for publication. They consisted of facts which had been gathered during the preparation of the "Inquiry," and which did not come within the design of it. The first was a very luminous exposition of 2 Thess. i: 9—"Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power.". He took the same view of the text which had been taken by Mr. Ballou, and other Universalists; but he went into the subject at length, and with such freshness of illustration that the article was regarded as one of the best essays that had ever been produced upon the subject.* He also came out with a similar essay, on Acts xvii: 30 31—"And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now com-

*See Universalist Magazine, vol. v., pp. 157, 161, 165, 169.

mandeth all men every where to repent: Because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by *that* man whom he hath ordained; *whereof* he hath given assurance unto all *men*, in that he hath raised him from the dead."* This essay was of equal value with the other. It is a somewhat singular fact, that Mr. Balfour had *never* studied the writings of Universalists. He began his inquiries *de novo*, taking no hints from any Universalist authors or preachers. He diligently compared Scripture with Scripture; and it was by this process that he was brought, in almost all the important cases, to the same results to which Mr. Ballou, and others, had been brought before him. There was, indeed, a freshness of illustration, and Mr. Balfour worked out many fine criticisms that tended to confirm what had been before said. He brought forward also the testimonies of learned men to sustain the expositions he had given. These things were new; but the expositions of themselves, (and this remark will apply also to the "Inquiry,") were not new.

His articles on the phrase Spirit of God.

In the summer of 1823, he had commenced the publication of a series of

*See Universalist Magazine, vol. v., pp. 183, 190, 196, 198, 206.

articles, in the "Evangelical Repertory,"* on the phrase "Spirit of God." As this publication continued but for a short time, he made the offer in September, 1824, to the editors of the Universalist Magazine to furnish the articles for that paper. They were cheerfully accepted; and those which had appeared in the "Repertory" were republished, so that the whole series appeared in the "Magazine." In these articles Mr. Balfour showed very plainly that he was a Unitarian. His object was to ascertain, "*what* say the Scriptures concerning the Holy Spirit?" That the Inquiry might be complete, he collected and examined every passage in which the Hebrew word *Ruh* and the Greek word *pneuma* occur, in whatever way translated in the common version. They were classed according to the best of his judgment, and the work was one of great labor. In fact we know of no work in our language which contains so thorough and valuable a treatise on this subject.†

---

*The "Evangelical Repertory" was conducted by Rev Edward Turner, and was published in Charlestown from July 1823 to July 1824, when it ceased. The articles on the "Spirit of God" were signed "Mikros," pp. 44, 39, 68.

†See Universalist Magazine, vol. vi., pp. 48, 49, 65, 73, 81, 101, 113, 146, 157, 202. vii, 48, 53, 57.

In August, 1825, Mr. Balfour addressed a letter to Rev. Lyman Beecher, then of Litchfield, Conn., and one of the most eminent of the Orthodox divines of New England. The doctor, in some one of his publications, had said— Letter to Dr. Beecher.

"When natural philosophers differ in theory, and facts are adduced by one, in confirmation of his opinions, an obligation is supposed to be laid on the other to account for these facts in accordance with his theory; and the philosopher who makes no reply to matters of fact, and who makes no attempt to account for them upon his own system, is supposed to be vanquished, and to be conscious that he is vanquished. The rule is certainly fair in natural science, and why it should not be applied to moral subjects is more than I can perceive. It is a hopeless case to adduce facts in evidence, if all an opponent has to do is to pass them over in silence, or to make a diversion to draw away the attention of the unwary."*

So had Dr. Beecher said, in his controversy with the Unitarians. Mr. Balfour's eye caught the passage. *He* had adduced *facts* in confirmation of his opinions as to the Scriptural use of the words *Sheol*, *Hades*, *Tartarus* and *Gehenna*. In this way he had laid his opponents, according to Dr. Beecher's own confession, under an obligation to account for those facts, in accordance

*See the "Christian Spectator" of June, 1825, p 303.

with their use of those words. And if they made no reply to those matters of fact which Mr. Balfour had adduced, the latter held that they were vanquished, and that *they knew* they were vanquished. He put home the Dr.'s argument to him in his own words, as follows:

"For eighteen months my book has been before the public. Your decision in my case is, that for this length of time, an obligation has been laid on the whole Orthodox body to account for the facts I have stated in accordance with their theory of hell torments. But have they discharged this obligation? Mr. Sabine professed to answer my book, but he no more attempts to account for the facts than he does for the spots in the sun. For the same length of time the obligation has rested on you, but in violation of your own rule with the Unitarians, you have not attempted to account for these facts. Am I to conclude that you are vanquished, from your silence about them? or, am I to conclude that you have one rule for Unitarians and another for yourself? Do you claim the exclusive right to lay heavy burdens on other men's shoulders to account for facts which militate against their system, yet relieve yourself from all obligation to account for facts which sap the foundation of your own? Must you be permitted to judge others, yet not suffer yourself to be judged? and measure to them by a rule you will not admit just in measuring to you again? Say, if we must altow you the privilege to expose the mote in your brother's eye, yet no one must say a word to you about the beam that is in your own? You have too much sense to think that such a course is either like a philosopher or a divine, or that men of ordinary sense will submit to it. Abandon, then, your rule as false, and retract your statements

in the above quotation, or renounce all pretensions to philosopher or divine, yea to common consistency." *

It is scarcely necessary to say that Dr. Beecher never made any reply to this epistle, nor any direct and acknowledged reference to Mr. Balfour's Inquiry.

Mr. Balfour continued his efforts to illustrate those passages of Scripture which had been supposed to teach the doctrine of endless misery. In the month of November, 1825, he sent to the editors of the "Magazine" a full illustration of the phrase "day of judgment," containing many very valuable criticisms, confirming the views which Universalists had been in the habit of taking of those passages in which that phrase occurs.† Immediately after this, at the call of an "Inquirer," he furnished valuable illustrations of the meaning of John v: 28, 29—"Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." ‡ In

John v., 28, 29, and 2 Cor., v. 10.

*Universalist Magazine—vol. vii: p. 31.
†The same work—vii: p. 86.
‡The same work—vii: pp. 103, 105.

this, as in the other cases, he had embraced the opinions of Universalists without reading any of their writings, being led thereunto by comparing Scripture with Scripture. And, not weary in well doing, he prepared a very full and satisfactory exposition of 2 Cor., v: 10—"For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things *done* in *his* body, according to that he hath done, whether *it be* good or bad."* By these efforts Mr. Balfour rendered very important services to the cause of truth.

The second Inquiry.

In June, 1826, came out the work which has ever since been denominated Balfour's Second Inquiry. It was called "An Inquiry into the Scriptural Doctrine concerning the Devil and Satan; and into the extent of duration expressed by the terms *Olim*, *Aion* and *Aionios*. rendered everlasting, forever, &c., in the Common Version, and especially when applied to punishment."† The intent of the title page at the last section was to assert the fact that the inquiry into the ex-

*See Universalist Magazine—vol. vii: pp. 111, 119, 125, 131, 135.

†The first edition was published in Charlestown, by George Davidson.

tent of duration expressed by Olim, and the other words, had respect particularly to those cases in which those words were applied to punishment. In brief, the results of Mr. B.'s inquiries in these fields were, that the words *devil* and *Satan*, as used by the sacred writers, did not signify a personal devil, according to the vulgar superstitions upon the subject; but were susceptible of interpretations much more consistent with common sense and with truth. Mr. Balfour had never read the celebrated Treatise on Atonement by Rev. Hosea Ballou; but he had explained the temptation in the garden of Eden, and that of our Saviour in the same way which Mr. Ballou had pursued,* and taken the same ground generally in the book, in both its parts.

The plan of the work was this: It was divided into two parts. Mr. Balfour said,—

"In the first of these Inquiries, the chief object of the author has been to ascertain if SATAN or the DEVIL be a Fallen Angel or a real Being? If not, what is the meaning of the sacred writers, in all the various texts where these words occur? The following is a brief statement of its contents:

Sec. 1. The common opinions entertained of the Devil and Satan, briefly stated.

*For an evidence of Mr. Ballou's happiness on this account, see Universalist Magazine, vol. viii., p. 10.

Sec. 2. Remarks on Genesis iii , showing that the serpent which deceived Eve was not a fallen angel.

Sec. 3. All the texts in the Old Testament, where the original word Satan occurs, considered.

Sec. 4. The opinion that the Devil or Satan is a real Being, with other connected opinions, shown to have their origin in heathenism.

Sec. 5. All the passages in the New Testament where the term Satan occurs, considered.

Sec. 6. All the passages where the original term *diabolos*, or devil is used, considered.

Sec. 7. All the passages considered in which the terms Devil or Satan are both used by the sacred writers synonimously.

Sec. 8. All the texts considered, where the Devil is supposed to be called the evil one, the tempter, the great dragon, the serpent, and old serpent, the prince of this world, the prince of the power of the air, and the god of this world.

Sec. 9. Facts stated, showing that the Devil is not a fallen Angel, or real Being.

Sec. 10. Objections considered.

Sec. 11. Concluding remarks, pointing out the evils which have arisen from the common opinions entertained of the Devil and Satan."

Concerning the second part, the author also said,—

"The principal object of the author in the second Inquiry has been, to notice in what way the sacred writers use the terms OLIM, AION, and AIONIOS, and to examine particularly all the texts where any of them apply these terms to punishment.

Sec. 1. All the texts noticed where *olim* occurs in the Old Testament, but is rendered by words which do not express or imply eternal duration.

Sec. 2. All the passages noticed where *olim* is used,

and rendered by words which convey the idea of endless duration.

Sec. 3. All the texts where *olim* occurs, is rendered by words which convey the idea of endless duration, and applied to punishment, particularly considered.

Sec. 4. General remarks on *aion* and *aionios*, as used in the New Testament.

Sec. 5. All the places noticed where *aion* and *aionios* are rendered ages, course, never, forever, evermore, eternal, everlasting, but which have no relation to punishment.

Sec. 6. All the places where *aion* and *aionios* are rendered world, considered.

Sec. 7. All the places where *aion* and *aionios* is used to express the duration of punishment, particularly considered, in whatever way rendered in the common version.

Sec. 8. Concluding remarks on *olim*, *aion*, and *aionios*, throughout the Bible, whether applied to God, to life, or punishment."

Hudson's Letters to Ballou.

In the spring of 1827 came out a work written by Rev. Charles Hudson, then of Westminster, Mass., addressed to the Rev. Hosea Ballou, the design of which was to support the doctrine of a future limited punishment. It was entitled "A Series of Letters addressed to Rev. Hosea Ballou, of Boston, being a vindication of the doctrine of a Future Retribution, against the principal arguments used by him, Mr. Balfour and others." Mr. Hudson sought to overthrow the religious system of Rev.

Mr. Ballou. There is much room for doubt, whether Mr. Hudson gave a proper view of Mr. Ballou's opinions. Be this as it may, he professed to examine his arguments and refute them; and he aimed to establish the doctrine of future retribution, by analogy, by the alleged inequalities of providence in the present world, and by various testimonies from the Scriptures. The work never had a wide circulation; and it was made more eminent by Mr. Balfour's reply to it, and the controversy that ensued, than by any other circumstance.*

Balfour's Essays.

At the time of the appearance of Mr. Hudson's work, feeling as Mr. Balfour did, it was to have been expected that he would reply to it. His name was used in the title page; and the work was professedly an attempted confutation of some of the arguments which he had published. He resolved, therefore, to bring out the results of his inquiries into the three following general subjects, viz., of the Intermediate State, the Resurrection from the Dead, and the Greek terms rendered judge, condemn, damnation, &c. The latter part of the

*The work was printed by David Watson, Woodstock, Vt., 1827. 12mo, pp. 312.

work consisted of "remarks on Mr. Hudson's Letters, addressed to Mr. Hosea Ballou, and others, in vindication of a future retribution." The plan of the work is thus described:

ESSAY I.

On the Intermediate State of the Dead.

Sec. 1. The Scriptures examined respecting the state of man's Body, Soul, and Spirit, between death and the resurrection.

Sec. 2. On Ghosts, and their intercourse with this world after death.

Sec. 3 On the various opinions which have been entertained respecting the nature of man's soul; its immortality; its condition after death; whence such opinions originated; and how they came to be incorporated with the Christian religion.

Sec. 4. Facts stated, showing that the common opinions respecting man's soul, and its condition after death, cannot be true.

Sec. 5. Objections considered.

ESSAY II.

On the Resurrection from the Dead.

Sec. 1. On the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the Dead.

Sec. 2. On the Resurrection of Man from the Dead.

Sec. 3. Remarks addressed to Christians, Jews, and Deists.

ESSAY III.

On the Greek terms *krino*, *krisis*, *krima*, &c., rendered judge, judgment, condemned, condemnation, damned, damnation, &c., in the New Testament.

Concluding remarks, on Mr. Hudson's Letters, in Defence of a future Retribution, addressed to Messrs. Hosea Ballou, Balfour and others.

These essays had been commenced for the author's personal satisfaction, without any view to Mr. Hudson's book, or even to immediate publication. But as Mr. Balfour deemed them a full answer to it, he prepared them for the press. All the texts quoted by Mr. Hudson, in proof of a future retribution, are particularly considered, as well as the principle of analogy on which he reasoned concerning the future state; and the assumed ground on which he built his whole scheme of punishment after death, was shown to be without foundation in the Bible, as Mr. Balfour fully believed.

How the Essays were received.

On the subjects of the last two Essays, Universalists generally were agreed with Mr. Balfour; but there was much difference of opinion among them, as to the subject of the first. Those who agreed with him maintained that the Bible does not teach the inherent immortality of the human soul; and consequently that man's hope of immortality rests solely on the resurrection from the dead; and this hope of a resurrection rests solely on the fact of the resurrection of Christ. Mr. Balfour held that there was no intermediate state between death and the resurrection. Death, in his view, was *a sleep;* the patriarchs, it is said,

went down to the grave, *to sleep* with their fathers. All go to one place; all are of the dust, and all return to the dust again. The human race are unconscious between death and the resurrection. It must be confessed, concerning this work, that although it gave satisfaction to many, it did not meet with that general and cordial greeting from Universalists which Mr. Balfour's former works had received. He however fully believed it to be founded on the Scriptures; nor did his opinions on these points ever change. He was accustomed to say, "if you think I am wrong, show me my error. Give me a 'thus saith the Lord.' I bow to nothing but the word of God." This was the first point of any importance, in which Mr. Balfour had differed from Mr. Ballou; but not the slightest alienation was produced between them, by the publication of the work.

It was in the beginning of the year 1829, that Mr. Hudson* came out with Hudson's Reply to the Essays.

*At the time of which we speak, Rev. Charles Hudson was pastor of the Universalist Society in Westminster, Mass., where he resided for several years. He was sent from this town a Representative to the General Court of Massachusetts, and afterwards was elected to the Senate. Being a steady political partizan on the prevailing side, he was, in due course of time, sent from the District in

his reply to the Essays. Mr. Balfour was in the habit of expressing his opinions without very great reserve; and Mr. Hudson, not being sufficiently careful, indulged in a style of tartness and retaliation which made this controversy between two Universalists more unpleasant than it otherwise would have been. Mr. Hudson professed to treat the subject in the following manner:

1st. He examined Mr. Balfour's pretensions to fairness, and noticed his severity and his mistakes. 2d. He stated and examined his system; 3d, he examined his rules of interpretation; 4th, he considered the subject of the state of the dead, and showed the evidence of the present immortality of the soul, and of an intermediate state; 5th, he stated the question in debate as it respected future punishment; 6th, he endeavored to prove a future *judgment* from the Scriptures; 7th, he gave alleged proofs of a future *retribution;* and lastly, he sought to answer the objections to his system. It must be confessed that Universalists at large did not take a very deep interest in this controversy.

Balfour's Letters to Hudson.

That we may not break the continuity of the history of the controversy with Mr. Hudson, we introduce in this place an account of Mr. Balfour's Letters to

---

which he lived as a Representative to the Congress of the United States. He subsequently lost his election: but obtained a lucrative appointment under the general government, which he holds to this day.

him. It was a large duodecimo of 360 pages, and was called Letters on the Immortality of the Soul, the Intermediate State of the Dead, and a Future Retribution, in reply to Mr. Charles Hudson, Westminster, Mass."* Mr. Balfour felt not that he commenced this controversy. He felt that he was attacked by Mr. Hudson, in his Letters to Rev. Hosea Ballou. As he had most fully avowed, on the publication of his Inquiries and Essays, that he stood ready to defend the doctrines laid down in those books, and as he was the last man to shrink from a fair and manly controversy, he felt it his duty to reply to Mr. H., notwithstanding the latter professed to be a Universalist. Another fact is to be remembered: In Mr. Balfour's mind, the doctrine of the natural immortality of the human soul, and that of future retribution, stood or fell together. Many Universalists differed from him in opinion, as to this subject of immortality; but *he* most devoutly and religiously believed, that the only hope of the immortality of man was in the Christian doctrine of the resurrection. Before that event shall take place, in his view, man, the whole man, from the time of death, sleeps; and

*Published by G Davidson, Charlestown, 1829

is capable neither of suffering or of joy. He believed that the resurrection was a Christian doctrine; but he held that the doctrine of the soul's separate existence in the intermediate state, was a heathen doctrine, as was also the doctrine of future retribution for the sins of this life. On this whole subject of the controversy with Mr. Hudson, and of the origin of the two doctrines named, Mr. Balfour said,—

"My first eight letters are a reply to Mr. Hudson's book; and he will admit I have overlooked nothing material in it, or slightly passed over what he deems his strongest proof texts and arguments. I have followed him in his course from its commencement to its conclusion. Of the success of my labors the reader must judge. I am sorry to say he pursued a different course with my Essays. To the five additional letters I solicit the reader's careful attention; particularly to the tenth and eleventh. The doctrines of the immortality of the soul, and a future retribution are not taught in the Old Testament, by Mr. Hudson's own showing; and in these two letters we think it proved they had their origin in heathenism. He contends they had their origin in revelations now lost, without affording any proof that they ever existed. On the contrary we think it is shown by a profusion of evidence, that such opinions arose from the vain speculations of heathen philosophers; were imbibed by the Jews in their intercourse with them; were early introduced into the Christian church, by converts from Judaism and heathenism; and have been transmitted to us as a part of Christianity ever since. It is shown in the eleventh letter, that Luther held the opinions for which I contend.

"This controversy was first begun by Mr. Hudson. It now remains with him whether it shall here end. I never wished to provoke a controversy among Universalists, and I have no desire to continue it. Should he choose to reply, or any one else, I request that proof be adduced from *Scripture* that the soul is immortal, and has a conscious existence in a disembodied state. Until this is settled, it is useless to discuss—is it to suffer in this state? Or what is to be the nature or duration of its punishment? To the Scriptures I appeal to decide this question, and trust we shall hear no more about *lost revelations* to support it. We have given the history of the soul's immortality and its punishment after death, but this is done merely to show that Mr. Hudson's opinions are of heathen origin. Let it be shown from the Bible that they are not."*

History of the doctrine of future punishment.

The most valuable sections of Balfour's Letters to Hudson are those which embrace the history given therein of the doctrine of future punishment for the deeds of this life. He divides this subject into two parts, first tracing the history from the earliest times to the introduction of philosophy into Rome; and second, from the latter period to the present time. This account is abridged from the History of Philosophy by Dr. Wm. Enfield; and will be very valuable to every one, who cannot obtain the work itself; though it must be remembered, that Dr. En-

*Letters to Hudson, Introduction, pp. 11, 12.

field's work is an abridgement of Brucker's on the same subject.* Mr. Hudson published no other volume, and thus the controversy closed. Mr. Hudson's books, and Mr. Balfour's Essays and Letters, did not have a large sale; and no second edition of them was ever called for. Not so with the First and Second Inquiries,—they each passed through three editions.

President Allen attacks Mr. Balfour's works.

In the summer of 1828, President Allen, of Bowdoin College, gave a lecture to the students, entitled, "Lecture on the Doctrine of Universal Salvation, delivered in the chapel of Bowdoin College, by the President." Mr. Balfour felt then that he was attacked in high places. He sought early to get a copy of the lecture, for it had been previously announced by the President that he was about to review Mr. Balfour's book, and a friend living in the vicinity had given Mr. B. information of the fact. He supposed it would be a work of elaborate criticism. Judge, then, of his surprise, when he found that the whole was embraced in a single lecture to the students, and that it was altogether a superficial production.

*Dr. Enfield's was a clear and able performance. He had been tutor and lecturer in the dissenting academy at Warrington, England.

There had been no little commotion in the Orthodox ranks, from the time of the publication of the First Inquiry. Travail and anguish seized them; but when the effect of all this labor was made visible, it was difficult to keep out of mind the proverb concerning the progeny of the mountain. President Allen sought to reply to Mr. Balfour, without naming him, as if he disdained the antagonist with whom he must have felt himself insufficient to contend; but he made such allusions that there could be no doubt whose books he was reviewing, for he sometimes named the works. The pamphlet of forty pages was not thought too mean to be noticed by Mr. Balfour, although it had been described by a reviewer as made up of hackneyed and jaded assumptions.*

Balfour's Reply to President Allen.

The Reply of Mr. Balfour came out in the beginning of November, 1828. It was a large duodecimo pamphlet of upwards of seventy pages, and appeared in

*Mr. Balfour said, four years afterwards, "The Dr.'s attempt to refute the 'Inquiry,' was deemed so weak, even by his own friends, that his pamphlet was withdrawn from the bookstores and suppressed, if our information is correct. It is certain it was frequently asked for in the bookstores of Boston, but could not be obtained; and very few persons in this region ever procured a copy of it." Inquiry, 3d edition, p. 8.

the form of a letter to the President. It was written in Mr. Balfour's pungent, candid, matter-of-fact manner; and it did not fail to carry conviction to the mind of every honest inquirer after truth who read it. It was thought by some that Prof. Stuart instigated Dr. Allen to this attack; but of this we never saw any proof. The Professor still remained silent, and neglected his half-made promise* to "enter the lists."

Another Letter to Dr. Beecher.

In December, 1828, Mr. Balfour attended a public lecture in the vestry of the Society in Hanover street, of which the elder Dr. Beecher was then pastor, and heard a lecture from him on the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus. This lecture was unquestionably designed to counteract the influence of the First Inquiry among the Orthodox themselves. The Dr maintained that our Lord, in this parable, clearly taught the immortality of the soul, and that *Hades* was a place of future punishment. He also took the ground that *Ge-*

*Prof. Stuart had intimated, that if he could know the name and object of his antagonist, and contend on some other ground than that of a newspaper, he might be induced to enter the lists. "I must know the name and object of my antagonist, before I enter the lists; and contend on some other ground than that of a newspaper" See his letter of June 19th, 1821, published in "Universalist Magazine," vol. iii., p. 1.

henna was made an emblem, by the sacred writers, of future punishment. There were only two things which the Dr.'s sermon lacked, according to Mr. Balfour, viz., argument and truth. The latter came out with a "Letter to Rev. Dr. Beecher,"* to which the Dr., with profound sagacity, never condescended to pay any attention.

Mr. Balfour as a preacher.

During the time that Mr. Balfour was engaged in preparing these works, and, in fact, ever since his conversion to Universalism, he had been diligent as a preacher. Frequent calls were made upon him from various parts of New England, which he always held himself ready to meet, so far as it was in his power to do it. He was not a popular orator, but a ready speaker, whose discourses always abounded with sound sense and scriptural knowledge. These labors Mr. Balfour continued, as calls were made upon him for many years, and until he was obliged, by bodily infirmities, to desist from them. We may name, in this place, a journey made by him to the State of Maine, in the summer of 1830. He passed through Portsmouth, N. H., to Portland, thence to Norway, Buckfield, Turner, Augusta, Bowdoinham, Brunswick, Bath, Wiscasset, Waldoboro, Union,

*See Trumpet, vol. i., pp. 105, 106.

Searsmont, Montville, Belfast, Hallowell, Gardner, preaching in all these places, to crowds of hearers. He enjoyed himself highly on this journey, and his labors were said to have been the cause of great good.*

Stuart's Exegetical Essays.

In the fall of 1830, more than six years after the First Inquiry had been published, Prof. Stuart came out with a book designed to counteract the effect of Mr. Balfour's publications. At this time there had appeared of Mr. Balfour's works, his First and Second Inquiries, Essays and Letters to Hudson, with the replies to Sabine and to Allen. The Professor's work was entitled "Exegetical Essays on several words relating to Future Punishment."† It was unquestionably designed to break down the influence of Mr. Balfour's works, especially the three first named; but the Professor had not the magnanimity to name either the works or their author. Whether this was consistent with candor or Christian charity, we shall not undertake here to discuss.‡

Plan of the Exegetical Essays

The "Exegetical Essays" were framed on the following plan:

*See Trumpet, vol. iii., p. 33.

†Andover, Mass., 1830. 12mo, pp. 156.

‡The Professor evidently felt as if this circumstance

First, the Professor treats of *Aion* and *Aionios*, which had been so fully treated by Mr. Balfour in his Second Inquiry. He speaks, as he says, 1st, of the importance of the subject. 2d, The Classical use of the words in question. 3d, Their sense as employed in the New Testament. 4th 5th and 6th, Meaning of *Aion*. 7th. Instances of Aion in respect to future punishment, of which he claims there are five instances only, 2 Peter ii: 17. Jude. v: 13. Rev. xiv: 11. xix: 3. xx: 10. 8th, General Summary of the meaning of Aion. He comes then to the ad-

---

needed an apology. "That I have not referred, in the general course of discussion to those who differ from me in opinion (one instance only excepted) they must not put to the score of neglect; for neither have I referred to those with whom I agree. My wish is, not to appear in a polemic attitude," &c. Prof. Stuart had openly attacked Dr. Channing, and the Unitarians generally; and nine years before the publication of the Exegetical Essays, he had almost professed a willingness to "enter the lists" with *the Inquirer*, if he could know his real name, and contend on some other ground than that of a newspaper. See a previous note. How does it happen, then, that he was so averse to assuming "a polemic attitude" just at that time? It is certain that on other occasions he had had no objections to assuming such an attitude. Not six months before the "Exegetical Essays" appeared, he had addressed his Letter to Dr Channing on Religious Liberty, which was of a very polemical character; and he somewhat blamed Dr. Channing for not having noticed the works which had been addressed to him. See work last mentioned, p. 47.

jective *Aionios*. 10th, First class of meanings. 11th, Second class of meanings. 12th, Instances in respect to future punishment. These are Matt. xviii: 8. xxv: 41, 46. Mark iii: 29. 1 Thess. i: 9. Heb. vi. 2. Jude. 6. 13th. General Summary of the meanings of Aionios. 14th. Meaning of the corresponding Hebrew word in the Old Testament. 15th. General Summary in regard to that word. 16th. Use of *Aion* and *Aionios* in the Septuagint. 17th. Bearing of the testimony on the subject of future punishment. 18th. Results. 19th. Manner in which *Aion* and *Aionios* have been treated by some critics and lexicographers.

Having used up half the bulk of his work, on *Aion* and *Aionios*, he comes to consider the words *Sheol*, *Hades*, *Tartarus* and *Gehenna*, the subjects embraced in the First Inquiry. He considers I. *Sheol*. 1st. Moral meaning of the word. 2d. Remarks on the common translation of Sheol. 3d. Manner of using figurative language in respect to the objects of a future world. 4th. Secondary signification of Sheol. 5th. Popular views of Sheol. 6th. Remarks thereon. 7th. General conclusion. II. *Hades*. 1st. Classical sense of the word. 2d. *Hades*, as used by the sacred writers. 3d. Remarks on the use of

Hades in the Scriptures. III. *Tartarus.* IV. *Gehenna.* To this most important part of the subject the Professor devotes only seven out of his one hundred and fifty-six pages. He acknowledges that primarily *Gehenna* signified the valley of Hinnom, on the boundaries of Jerusalem. Both parties were agreed, that it is used in the Scriptures in a secondary sense. He maintained, but without sufficient authority, that it referred to a future state of punishment. With a few general remarks, he closes his book.

Faults of the Exegetical Essays.

One great fault of the "Exegetical Essays" was, that the Professor spent the most of his strength on subjects that were of the least importance, and which he acknowledged, in effect, to be so. The *great* points in respect to the words and phrases he considered, received the smallest share of his attention. Think of the fact, that he should have given so small a section to the word *Gehenna!* which should have been the main point of his inquiries. Another great insufficiency of this work is the circumstance that he paid no attention whatsoever to the chapters of facts submitted by Mr. Balfour. He knew that those facts were regarded by Universalists as forming a body of evidence incontrovertible, in favor of

their understanding of the Scriptural use of the word *Gehenna*. Facts are difficult things to deal with. When facts are adduced in support of any theory, it manifestly devolves on those who are opposed to that theory to account for those facts; and if they do not account for them, if they pass them over in silence, and appear as if they would keep them out of sight, we say, with the elder Dr. Beecher, "it is evident such persons are vanquished, and that they are sensible they are vanquished."*

Reply to the Exegetical Essays.

In a few months after the "Exegetical Essays" appeared, came

*The "Exegetical Essays" produced little effect. In truth, Prof. Stuart himself seems afterward to have been doubtful on the subject of endless misery. He has expressed himself at times, in such terms, that he has been accused, by some of his Orthodox brethren, of heresy. Tholuck found fault as to the views of the Professor on the subject of original sin. See the periodical edited by Tholuch, entitled "*Literarischer Anzeiger*," of April 7, 1834. He accuses the Professor of using the same objections against the doctrine of original sin which had been employed by the Rationalists of Germany A paper in our own country, called the "Presbyterian," echoed the voice of Tholuch; and the well known "Puritan" (Nov. 4th, 1841,) re-echoed it. Many will remember the painful suspicions that were excited in some Orthodox minds, by the Professor's article in the "Bibliotheca Sacra" for February, 1843, on "Angelology," in which he said, "that as to the power of Satan over the wicked, it is every where presented in the New Testament as something which will wholly cease after a time."

out Mr. Balfour's reply.* It must be confessed that in following up the Professor's train of thought, Mr. Balfour had not a difficult labor to perform. The Professor's arguments, or rather shows of argument, were replied to with great candor, and with great vigor. The reply was embraced in five letters. In the first of these, Mr. Balfour

*It was entitled "Reply to Prof. Stuart's Exegetical Essays on several words relating to Future Punishment." By Walter Balfour, Charlestown, Mass. Boston, printed for the author, 1831.

The Professor's small work, entitled "Hints on Prophecy," aimed at the delusion of Millerism, also excited painful sensations among some of the Orthodox party. He maintained, in this work, that by far the larger proportion of mankind will be saved. "That the final proportion of men who will be redeemed must be greater, yea *much greater* than that which will be lost, seems to be made certain by the ancient promise, that 'the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head,' Gen. iii: 15. But how can this promise be true, if, after all, Satan shall destroy the larger portion of the human race?" Second Edition, Andover, 1842, p. 132. In the same work the Professor interpreted the passages in the New Testament which treat of "the end of the world," much as the Universalists do, and this was another cause of grief to some of his brethren. The "New York Evangelist," that organ of popular Orthodoxy, spoke of the opinions of Professors Stuart and Bush, on this point, in the following terms: "The tendency of these views is to destroy the Scripture evidence of the doctrine of any real end of the world, any day of final, general judgment, or general resurrection of the body. The style of interpretation, we assert, *tends fearfully to Universalism. This tendency* we are prepared to prove." But one of

considered what the Professor had said on the words *Aion* and *Aionios*. He separated his assertions from his arguments, showing that the former were by far the most numerous. He pointed out his misapplications of Scripture; and showed, too, that notwithstanding his boasted regard for the Scriptures, he seemed to rely much more upon the testimony of Talmudic and Rabbinic writers, than upon that of the inspired servants of God. In fine, it must be said, after

---

the most remarkable articles ever written by Prof. Stuart, was published in the "Biblical Repository," A. D. 1840. It was professedly in defence of the doctrine of endless misery; but, like Archbishop Tillotson's famous sermon on that point, it had a decided influence to weaken the faith of those who believed it. We make the following quotations:

"Next to the inquiry whether the soul is immortal, stands in point of importance and interest the question, '*Whether there is a state of rewards and punishments beyond the grave, and whether that state is eternal?*' A more fearful question cannot be raised by the human mind, than by asking whether the punishment of the wicked in a future world is to be regarded as endless?

"No reflecting man can wonder that so many among us are so deeply agitated by this subject. While the great majority of Christians consider the inquiry suggested by this last question as answered, yea fully answered, by the Scriptures, yet there are not a few who claim to be considered Christians, whose minds are filled with difficulty in respect to the subject of endless misery in a future world."

Speaking of those who believe in the final salvation of all men, he said,—

"Not a few persons in our community secretly belong to this class. They perceive the extravagant and obtru-

looking carefully over the Essays and the Reply, that the Professor left the controversy concerning *Aion* and *Aionios* just where he found it when he begun. No dependance can be placed on the mere force of these words, to sustain the doctrine of the endless duration of punishment. As Isaac Taylor says, "The unfixed practice of our English translators in rendering the Scripture terms of duration, has thrown a disadvantage upon certain very momentous questions,

sive assumptions of those who deny any future punishment; and fearing to encourage them in their error, they withhold the expression of their own doubts and difficulties, guarding, at the same time, from expressing and inculcating any positive belief in the doctrine of endless punishment. Thus they live and perhaps die, without ever making any explicit avowal of their secret belief, or at least of their secret doubts. And among these are not a few of the professed preachers of the gospel.

"It were easy to prefer accusations in this case, of insincerity and the want of open and honest dealing; and this is sometimes done. To such accusations, indeed, there are some who would be justly subjected. But I am not persuaded that all doubters of this class are to be taxed with hypocrisy and double dealing. There are minds of a very serious cast, and prone to reasoning and inquiry, that have in some way come into such a state, that doubt on the subject of endless punishment, cannot, without the greatest difficulty, be removed from them.

"They commence their doubts, it is probable, by some *a priori* reasoning on this subject. 'God is good. His tender mercy is over all the works of his hands. He has no pleasure in the death of a sinner. He has power to prevent it. He knew before he created man, and made

and has made many affirmations of the inspired writers *seem* vague, which probably were to themselves, and their first readers, quite definite; or at least more so than they are to our ears. The confusion hence arising, has led certain controvertists to found an argument upon the supposed force of a single term (*Aionios*) to which Scripture usage has given a very great latitude of meaning; and which therefore must, in every place, receive its specific value from the

---

him a free agent, that he would sin. In certain prospect of his endless misery, therefore, his benevolence would have prevented the bringing of him into existence. No father can bear to see his own children miserable without end, not even when they have been ungrateful and rebellious; and God, our Heavenly Father, loves us better than any earthly parent does or can love his children.'

"Besides, our sins are temporary and finite, for they are committed by temporary and finite beings; and in a world filled with enticements both from without and from within. It is perfectly easy for Omnipotence to limit, yea to prevent, any mischief which sin can do; so that the endless punishment of the wicked is unnecessary, in order to maintain the divine government and keep it upon a solid basis. Above all, a punishment without end, for the sins of a few days or hours, is a proportion of misery incompatible with justice as well as mercy. And how can this be any longer necessary, when Christ has made atonement for sin, and brought in everlasting redemption from its penalty?

"The social sympathies, too, of some men are often deeply concerned with the formation of their religious opinions. They have lost a near and dear friend and relative by death, one who never made any profession of

subject in hand."* In his second letter, Mr. Balfour considers that section of the Professor's work in which he treated of the word *Sheol*. The Professor did not maintain that there were more than *five* texts, out of the whole *sixty-four* instances in which *Sheol* occurs in the Bible, which had relation to future punishment; and

*See the work entitled "Saturday Evening," 3d Am. ed., Crocker & Brewster, Boston, p. 311.

religion or gave good reason to suppose that his mind was particularly occupied with it. What shall they think of his case? Can they feel that one so dear to them, has become eternally wretched? an outcast forever from God? Can they endure the thought that they are never to see or associate with him any more? Can heaven it self be a place of happiness for them, while they are conscious that a husband or wife, a son or a daughter, a brother or a sister, is plunged into a lake of fire from whence there is no escape? It is impossible, they aver, to overcome such sympathies as these. It would be unnatural and even monstrous to suppress them. They are, therefore, as they view the case, constrained to doubt whether the miseries of a future world can be endless."

It cannot be said, that Prof. Stuart referred here merely to Universalists, or those who are associated with them. It is much more reasonable to believe that he referred to many members of the Orthodox churches, who, he knew, reasoned in this manner, taking good care, in the meantime, to keep their doubts to themselves.

"If there are any whose breasts are strangers to such difficulties as these, they are to be congratulated on having made attainments almost beyond the reach of humanity in the present world; or else to be pitied for ignorance, or the want of a sympathy, which seems to be among the first elements of our social nature. With the great

Mr. Balfour said, "Such are your five texts in proof that *Sheol* denotes, 'the world of misery, the region of the second death.'" And applying to him his own words, he said further, "but according to your sound rule in philology, what is there in these texts or their contexts which 'imperiously demands' that *Sheol* should have such a sense given it? What there is which demands it here, I cannot see." In his Third Letter Mr. Balfour meets that part of the

---

mass of thinking Christians, I am sure such thoughts as these must, unhappily for them, be acquaintances too familiar That they agitate our breasts as storms do the mighty deep, will be testified by every man of a tender heart, and who has a deep concern in the present and future welfare of those whom he loves

"It would seem to be, from such considerations, and the like to these, that a belief in a future repentance and recovery of sinners, has become so wide spread in Germany, pervading even the ranks of those who are regarded as serious and evangelical men, in respect to most or all of what is called Orthodox doctrine, saving the point before us. Such was the case also with some of the ancient fathers, and such is doubtless the case with not a few of our day, who are far removed from noisy and obtrusive sectarianism, and who even do not venture positively to assert and maintain the modified doctrine of universal salvation, viz., the final restoration of all to divine favor, after punishment and repentance.

"Can we find it in our hearts secretly to reproach doubters of this retired and modest class; who will not even venture to assert what they hope is true, and on the whole do believe to be true?"

These extracts from Prof. Stuart may be found in the article entitled "Future Punishment, as exhibited in the

'Exegetical Essays' which treated of the word *Hades*. He followed the Professor from one position to another, carefully replying to every thing he had said, and showing that he utterly failed to sustain his points. He paid large attention to the Professor's argument founded on the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, and certain passages in the Apocalypse; and concerning these points he remarked, that "if these passages are the grounds on which endless hell torments are defended, even by Prof. Stuart, [so manifestly must they be perverted from their true sense to make out the points,] the day must be at hand when this doctrine will be totally and I hope forever abandoned. The very attempt by *such* a man to support it by *such* proofs, proves it is indefensible from the plain testimony of God, and must hasten the day of its destruction." p. 206. In letter fourth, Mr. Balfour considered what the Professor had said as it respects

Book of Enoch," American Biblical Repository, for July, 1840, pp 1, 2, 17 to 22. The Professor states that his own mind had been "deeply anxious and distressed" on this subject, p. 28 Pity he had not learned of Jesus, instead of men, for then he would have found "rest unto his soul," Matt. xi: 28 to 30. He attempts to remove the doubts of his brethren in regard to the rectitude of the divine government in view of endless misery, but the attempt was a signal failure.

St. Peter's use of the word *Tartarus*. The Professor's great mistake here lay in supposing that because the apostle used a word which had been employed in the heathen mythology, therefore he meant to adopt the heathen fables themselves. The fifth letter treats of *Gehenna;* and here Mr. Balfour found almost nothing to do. The Professor had not invalidated one of the great facts brought out in the First Inquiry. He misrepresented Mr. Balfour and the Universalists generally, in giving the idea that they held to no sense being attached to the word *Gehenna*, except literally the valley of Hinnom. All the plausibility he gave to his views, was founded on that misrepresentation. Mr. Balfour went through the work, replying with great patience to whatever Prof. Stuart had said; and at the close he rebuked him with severity for his personal reflections on Universalists, with whom by this time Mr. B. had become well acquainted. It must be said by every one who looks candidly into the matter, that the "Exegetical Essays" left the First and Second Inquiries utterly unimpaired.*

*Mr. Balfour's views of the First and Second Inquiries, as affected by the Exegetical Essays, were given, in a subsequent publication, in the following words:

"Before Mr. Stuart's Essays appeared, we supposed he

The last controversial book prepared by Mr. Balfour, was a reply to a certain section of a work by Rev. Bernard Whitman, a Unitarian clergyman of Waltham, Mass. Mr. W.'s book was entitled, "Friendly Letters to a Universalist on Divine Rewards and Punishments."* Although regarded as a man of large liberality, Mr. W. was by no means friendly to Universalists, especially that class of them who, like Mr. Balfour, did not believe that the Bible teaches the doctrine of a future punishment for the sins of this life. He fell unfortu-

Whitman's Letters to a Universalist.

*It came out in 1833, and was published by Brown, Shattuck & Co., Cambridge.

must have something new and powerful to produce; that the Inquiry would receive a full and fair reply, and that I should see in what my error consisted. But we are entirely disappointed; for like all the preceding attempts to refute it, the principal facts and arguments are passed over without any notice. Indeed, many of Mr. Stuart's statements confirm the views advanced in the Inquiry. We begin to suspect no respectable reply can be made to it which will prove that Sheol, Hades, Tartarus, or Gehenna, designates a place of endless misery to the wicked. We have too high an opinion of Mr. Stuart's understanding, to think that he considers his Essays deserving the name of an answer to the Inquiry. We have never heard of a single intelligent man, Orthodox or otherwise, who thinks his Essays a reply to it. But we have heard several express a contrary opinion. If the book, then, is not unanswerable, we may say it yet remains unanswered."

nately somewhat under the influence of that class, who had a separate existence at that time, and who called themselves Restorationists, by whom his antipathy to the other class of Universalists was much increased. In 1832, he prepared and published a volume of sermons, entitled "Village Sermons," which called forth a series of letters addressed to him, by that highly respected divine, Rev. L. R. Paige, of Cambridgeport.* It was probably these Letters of Mr. Paige, which led Mr. Whitman to prepare his principal work, "Letters to a Universalist."† It was a duodecimo volume of 356 pages; the largest work, we believe, ever produced by that author. It consisted of twelve letters. The spirit of it was unfriendly to that class of Universalists who did not profess to believe in future punishment as a doctrine of the Bible. It was a work prepared in great haste,—some of the arguments were weak and sophistical, and such as the author himself would, upon further reflection, have rejected.‡ This was the first, and,

*See Memoir of the Rev. Bernard Whitman, by Jason Whitman. Boston: B. H. Greene, 1837; p. 103. For Rev. Mr. Paige's Letters, see Trumpet, vol. v., pp. 16, 17, 21, 25, 36, 37.

†Memoir of Whitman, p. 104.

‡"This volume was prepared under unfavorable circum-

indeed only attack ever made by Unitarians upon Mr. Balfour's views of *Gehenna;* though be it remembered, that Mr. Whitman, imitating the false dignity of Prof. Stuart, sought to undermine the first "Inquiry," without naming either the work or its author.

Balfour's Reply to Whitman.

In the summer of 1834, came out Mr. Balfour's answer. He did not reply to the whole book, for that he was under no particular obligation to do; but he took up merely the sixth chapter, in which his views of *Gehenna* had been assailed.* He stated that he

*See "A Letter to Rev. Bernard Whitman, on the term Gehenna, rendered hell in the Common Version. By Walter Balfour. Boston: Thomas Whittemore and B B Mussey, 1834" Duodecimo, pp. 96.

stances, and written in great haste, and without opportunity for re-examination. Mr. Whitman sent to the printer each morning what he had written during the previous day. Under these circumstances it will not be thought strange that the volume should contain some arguments which are weak or sophistical, and which the author himself would, upon further reflection, have rejected." See the Memoir of Whitman, before referred to, written by his brother, p. 104. See also the following extract: "This volume ('Letters to a Universalist') was prepared in great haste, from materials furnished in part by the author's friends, and without sufficient care in the selection and arrangement of topics. It is diffuse to a fault, and contains some instances of weak and irrelevant reasoning." Christian Examiner, for July, 1837, p. 355. The article in the "Examiner" was from the pen of Rev. A. P. Peabody, the Unitarian clergyman of Portsmouth, N. H.

had no objection to replying to the whole of Mr. Whitman's book on certain conditions, which were, however, never complied with. Whether Mr. W. would have complied with them, had his life been spared, is doubtful; but about the time of the appearance of the reply, he was attacked with consumption, and died early in the month of November, 1834. Had Mr. Balfour known that Mr. W.'s sickness and death were so soon to follow, he would not probably have made the reply. Mr. Balfour complained, and very justly, that Mr. Whitman had "grossly misrepresented his views of Gehenna punishment," and hence that much of his labor was merely fighting a man of straw; for Mr. W. sought to persuade his readers that Mr. B. held that *Gehenna* must be taken in its *literal* sense, as a place of corporeal punishment in the valley of Hinnom, near Jerusalem. On the contrary Mr. B. held, and had defended the opinion at length in his First Inquiry, that although this was the literal sense, its general use in the New Testament was to signify the judgments which came upon the Jews. The reply was very naturally divided into three parts, viz: 1st. An exposure of Mr. Whitman's misrepresentations of the "Inquiry," and an examination of his

classification of the passages in which *Gehenna* occurs, and of his views of the sense of that term. 2d. An examination of his proof adduced from the Targums, and other Jewish writings of alleged antiquity, in defence of the opinion that Christ and James intended by *Gehenna* "*spiritual* punishment in the future state." And 3d. An examination of Mr. W.'s reply to Mr. B.'s objections to the common use of *Gehenna.*

This is perhaps one of the most pointed and spirited of all Mr. B.'s works. He dealt with his opponent in a plain, matter-of-fact manner. He was not accustomed to hold up false appearances. Wherever he could with consistency, respect and honor his opponent, he did it cheerfully; but he did not hesitate to give utterance to his thoughts, when called on to expose pedantry, vanity and misrepresentation. He was accustomed to go into the open field; he threw his whole soul into the Christian warfare; in fact, he was one of the most truly honest men that ever lived, who spoke out exactly what he thought it his duty to say. It was these attributes that gave to the Reply to Whitman its severity.*

*Mr. Whitman stated (p. 194) that he employed Rev. George Nichols and Rev. A. P. Peabody, tutor in H

General view. Thus had Mr. Balfour sustained himself at every point. He had defended his two "Inquiries" against the attacks of all who had assailed them. This was what he avowed, at the beginning, he would do; and he followed up that resolution. Mr. Whitman had been regarded as a theological champion among the Unitarians, since the publication of his celebrated Sermon at Waltham, in 1827, on denying the Lord Jesus. No one can read the chapter in his "Letters," (viz., that which treats of *Gehenna*,) and compare it with Mr. Balfour's Reply, without being perfectly satisfied that every one

brew and Mathematics in Harvard University, to assist him in making examinations into the Targums and Talmuds. He said, "they have spent hours and days in poring over the Targums and Talmuds, and other authorities in various ancient and modern languages." A person who knew the facts in the case, would smile at such a statement. It appeared, that all the extracts from the Targums and Talmuds which appeared in Mr. Whitman's book, were copied second-hand from Wetstein's New Testament; and Mr. Whitman's friends did not so much as verify their quotations by referring to the originals, as they copied Wetstein's mistakes, which such a reference would have corrected. Quoting from Wetstein, they spake of the Targum of Jonathan on Canticles and Job, whereas there is no such Targum in existence. Wetstein make the mistake, and Mr. Whitman's friends blindly followed him. In 1837, Mr. Peabody, who had then removed to Portsmouth, N. H., and become the pastor of the Unitarian Society there, caused to be published in the "Christian Examiner," a Review of the "Memoir of

of Mr. W.'s positions in regard to *Gehenna* is broken down, and that the doctrine of the "First Inquiry" is fully sustained. It was publicly asked, two years afterwards, by a very intelligent man, "If, with the assistance which Mr. Whitman acknowledges he had received from the Library and tutors of Harvard College, he failed, is it not fair presumptive evidence, that so far as the term *Gehenna* is concerned in the controversy between Universalists and their opponents, the former have truth upon their side?"*

*Trumpet, vol. viii: p. 205.

Whitman," in which he referred to the "Letters to a Universalist," and repeated the story as to the "critical researches" that had been made at the library of Harvard College to obtain materials for that work. This fact drew out from Rev. L. R. Paige two articles, entitled "Tricks of Authorship," in which he exposed the fact that the extracts professedly made from the Targums and Talmuds were copied *second-hand* from Wetstein; and that the extracts were not verified by comparison with the original. Trumpet, vol. x: 14, 18. Mr. Balfour also was drawn out once more in a "Letter to the Rev. A. P Peabody." He asked that reverend gentleman certain very important and pungent questions. At the end, he invited him to a discussion of the question as to the facts concerning Gehenna, advanced in the "First Inquiry," saying, "I am perfectly willing you should take Targum ground, Talmud ground, Bible ground, or any other ground which best answers your purpose." Trumpet, vol. x., p. 29. Mr. Peabody made no reply to this epistle.

Parsons Cooke against Mr. Balfour.

Rev. Parsons Cooke was, among the Orthodox, what Mr. Whitman had been among the Unitarians. He felt a strong desire to wield the sword of controversy. He had attacked the Unitarians with great vigor in the early part of his ministry. But as he gained more experience, he felt that "as the occasion for controversy with the Unitarians seemed to be subsiding, the occasion to contend with the Universalists seemed to be increasing."* He came out, therefore, with a duodecimo volume of 247 pages, entitled "Modern Universalism exposed, in an examination of the writings of Rev. Walter Balfour." He treated on the immortality of the soul; the intermediate state; the future judgment; eternal life; the words eternal, everlasting and forever, as applied to punishment; the meaning of the words *Sheol*, *Hades*, *Tartarus* and *Gehenna;* the existence and agency of evil spirits; the credulity of Mr. Balfour's disciples; and the sources of Universalism. Thus Mr. Cooke covered the whole ground of all Mr. Balfour's works. It must be confessed, however, that Mr. C.'s work never seems to have

*See "Modern Universalism Exposed, in an examination of the writings of Rev. Walter Balfour." By Parsons Cooke, of Ware, Mass. Lowell, 1834.

been highly regarded, even by the Orthodox themselves. It has been but little used, and we believe no second edition ever appeared. It was marked by cunning, rather than sound argument.

Mr. Balfour's Reply to Cooke.

Mr. Balfour did not think it necessary to bring out another book. If Mr. Cooke's *profundity* of investigation would permit him to answer *five* or *six* large volumes of closely arranged facts, in a duodecimo of 247 pages, giving up, too, the most of this space to subjects that might well have been spared, Mr. Balfour believed that it was best the reply should be given in the columns of a religious newspaper. He availed himself, therefore, of the "Trumpet;" and the reply came out in a series of Letters in the years 1834 and 1835. He examined all Mr. Cooke's principal positions, and showed that they were untenable. He showed, furthermore, that Mr. C. had abandoned all the distinctive points of Calvinism, and planted himself fully upon Arminian ground. The spirit manifested in Mr. C.'s work, and the misrepresentations with which it abounded, were made clearly manifest. Mr. B. took up section after section; set off one part against another; and did not hesitate to administer the rebukes which

Mr. C.'s temper, censoriousness and sectarian pride called for.* In concluding, he made the following proposition to Mr. Cook:

"Before I conclude, I submit to you the following proposals: Will you be pleased to select one or two of your strongest texts, and on which you are willing to rest the doctrine of endless misery, and let us thoroughly examine their true meaning. I take the liberty to suggest 2 Thess. i: 6 to 11, as Prof. Stuart, Dr. Allen and others, seem willing to risk the whole controversy upon it. Besides, I frankly confess to you, when I was a believer in endless punishment, I considered this the strongest text in its support. Should you be pleased to fix on this text, I hereby pledge myself to abide the issue. Prove that it teaches endless punishment, and I shall give you no more trouble about Universalism."

Mr. Cooke declines. Mr. Cooke, in a formal letter, declined the proffered controversy. "Mr. Balfour," said he, "is welcome to all the advantage of having the last word, and of my declining his challenge."† Thus the matter ended, and thus ended the last controversy in which Mr. Balfour ever engaged. There were small matters which came up, from time to time, and which claimed his attention; but nothing that might properly be dignified by the name of a controversy.

*See Trumpet, vol. vii., pp. 17, 29, 37, 53, 65, 81, 125, 173.

†See Boston Recorder of May 15th, 1835.

CHAP. VIII.

Mr. Balfour's Labors Draw to a Close.

Mr. Balfour continued to preach, though with less frequency, up to the year 1847. But before that year, it became apparent to his family and friends, who watched his course with much solicitude, that the days of his activity were fast passing away. In the year 1842 came out the third edition of his "Second Inquiry." In this edition a third part was added, "On the possession of devils mentioned in the New Testament." He had no occasion to make any other alteration, for he had seen no reason to change his opinions in respect to any of the subjects embraced in the work. To the day of his death, although he had availed himself of every opportunity to examine and re-examine his arguments, he saw no reason to change his opinion as to any doctrine he had defended. He died in the full belief of the truths he had inculcated. It was not uncommon for the editors of the partialist journals, and for over-zealous and rash

preachers, to misrepresent his views, especially on the subject of the immortality of the soul, or of the Scriptural sense of the word *Gehenna.* He sometimes would reply through the columns of a Universalist journal, and sometimes would let such matters pass as altogether unworthy of attention, since it would seem impossible that any honest man could be deceived by such means.* In the summer of 1844, he delivered a sermon in Newburyport, on "Salvation by Grace," in which he discussed the questions, *By* what are men saved? *through* what are they saved? and *from* what are they saved? This sermon had been listened to by Rev. Stephen Farley, among others, a Unitarian clergyman, residing in Amesbury, Mass. A brief correspondence took place between them, in which Mr. Balfour explicitly avowed that he had his religious education in the kirk of Scotland, where he got his earliest views of the grace of God; and that he had never seen reason to depart from his belief that salvation was by grace alone.† In November of this year, (1844,) a friend of his proposed in the public papers, that a uniform edition of his works should be published,

*See Trumpet, vol. xv., pp. 138, 150, 177, 194, 197.
†Trumpet, xvii: 1, 17, 22, 37, 45, 57.

with an autobiography, assigning as a reason why it should be done at once, that "he was fast declining," and that if it were not done soon, the opportunity would be passed for him to do it. He was able to preach but little.* In August, 1846, he lifted up his monitory voice to Universalists in regard to studying the Scriptures. One editor said, in introducing his sentiments, "the public of late does not often hear the voice of that faithful old Bible Christian, Father Balfour. His health, we are sorry to say, is far from being perfect. A slight paralysis that came upon him two or three years ago, has much enfeebled his step; yet he is still able to go about, and occasionally preaches." Speaking of Universalists, he said—

"They ought to see to it that Universalists in name be also Christians, and able and willing to defend what they believe from the Scriptures. There can be no safety from controversy until Christians are correctly and generally instructed *in the Scriptures*, for so long as general ignorance of the Scriptures prevails, there will always be some who will impose on the ignorant for selfish and sectarian purposes."

*The last sermon ever preached by Father Balfour was delivered in Malden, on Sunday, 26th Sept., 1847, on which occasion he officiated through the day. His sermons were observed to be delivered not with his accustomed vigor.

In July, 1848, the aged father was called to part with a dearly beloved son—a bright ornament to his family—Charles Devens Balfour, aged 34. The prominent type in the character of the son was filial love. Threatened long with a pulmonary complaint, he had resided in the West Indies, for the benefit of a tropical climate; and by successful business, he had amassed a considerable fortune. But climate and medical aid availed him but little; and he returned to his native town and breathed his last breath beneath his father's roof. The father then was so enfeebled in his powers of locomotion, that it was with much difficulty he came down stairs to the funeral. He bore the affliction like a man sustained with Christian hope. He knew in whom he believed. Although he differed from many in his views of the inherent immortality of the soul, yet he had full consolation in the fact of the resurrection from the dead. These convictions he again asserted in October, 1848.* He believed them to be the result of a careful study of God's word, and they were dear to his heart.

A last Letter to Prof. Stuart

On the publication of Prof. Crosby's edition of the celebrated Letter

*Trumpet, xxi: 68.

of Rev. John Foster, (with notes and appendix,) in the spring of 1849, Mr. Balfour was greatly moved with the extract therein given from Prof. Stuart's article in the Biblical Repository of July, 1840. The character of this article has been very fully shown in a preceding note.* Mr. Balfour saw, or thought he saw, that a great change had taken place in the Professor's mind and feelings; and though weak and feeble, he could not refrain from addressing him once more. He realised that the Professor had brought him into Universalism, and now it seemed almost as if the Professor was himself knocking at the door.

"Sir,—Any one who has read your Exegetical Essays, must see what a wonderful change has taken place in your mind since you wrote them, respecting Universalists, particularly the *Restorationists*. Its temper, its tone and language, are radically changed from the lion to the lamb. What smooth and honeyed language is now used to your Orthodox brethren, who are in doubt about the doctrine of endless punishment."

Mr. Balfour assured the Professor he still held fast the doctrines of the First and Second Inquiries and the Reply to the Exegetical Essays.

"It is plain from your statements, that *endless punishment* is on the wane among Orthodox preachers,

*See pp. 190 to 197 of this work.

and you seem to be vastly cooled down in its defence. And of late years there is but little talking or preaching about it. Ministers in this region seem to be afraid, or ashamed, to bring endless punishment into the pulpit, and when they do it, they handle the subject very briefly. I have no doubt but some of them have found out that preaching endless punishment is not the best way of making substantial and durable Christians. They are so sick of seeing so much chaff brought into their churches by this kind of preaching, that they are now trying what preaching Jesus Christ and him crucified' can accomplish. Endless punishment is dying out among us, and it will die out of the world in proportion as Christ's religion prevails in it."

Mr. Balfour acknowledged to the Professor he had found many good things in his works, and been profited by them. He invited him to express himself freely on the subject of human salvation, and almost seemed to expect from him an avowal of the great doctrine of the final salvation of all men. To their age, and his own increasing infirmities, he makes the following touching allusion:

"We are both old men, encompassed with bodily infirmities, and are near the grave. If either or both of us are in any important errors, we have but little time left us for further research, and a rectification of them. If you have any further light to impart from the Bible, I should like to see it, for I am willing to die in the harness, in my search after truth. But what is done ought to be done quickly; for I shall soon be beyond its doing me any good, by death or increasing bodily infirmity."

This, we think, was the last epistle ever published from his pen. The last article written by him for any public paper, appeared in the "Ladies' Repository," for April, 1850. It was a notice of Chapin's work on the Lord's Prayer. He sent an article subsequently to the "Trumpet," (May 18, 1850); but he intimated at the end that the article had been written for several months, and that the power of writing had forsaken him.

"This article was written more than six months ago, before I was disabled from writing. I send it without any additions, and with hardly any corrections, *for I am not able to attend to such things.*"

Rev. Wm. A. Drew's visit.

Feeble in body, but strong in faith, the good old saint attracted both the sympathy and admiration of those who visited him. We avail ourselves of the language of Rev. W. A. Drew, of Augusta, to describe a visit that he made to the sinking patriarch on the 5th of November, 1850:

"He cannot walk without much assistance, and is mostly confined to his chair and bed. He appeared pale, and bore the marks of an age beyond his years. He is now in his seventy-sixth year. If ever we saw the scriptural figure of a 'shock of corn fully ripe,' verified in the ripening piety of an earthly being, we thought we saw it in the submissive looks, the patient spirit and the triumphant joys of Father Balfour. God has brought him upon the last perch of life, and

given him wings of faith, with which he is just ready to fly away from earth and be at rest in heaven. We asked him if he had seen any cause yet to renounce his faith in a world's salvation? His characteristic reply was in these very words: 'I have seen no cause to change this faith; when I do, the world will know it; I am not one of the men who believe a thing, right or wrong.' We remarked to him that we believed his views of religion were always what are technically called evangelical. After a brief criticism on the word evangelical, as relating to good news, he replied that he had always been a friend of experimental religion, and trusted he always should enjoy it. The morality of heathen philosophers, which was as pure as the morality of modern philosophers, he thought had not the vital power in it which belongs to the Christian religion. He had tried to live an honest man before men, and he trusted he should die such before God. None could doubt this who ever knew him. He was anxious for the purity of our ministry. He would condemn none for their infirmities, and even when he spoke with emphasis against the misconduct of one that shall here be nameless, he would only say—'I am sorry for him, from the bottom of my heart. He loves the cause, but does not *so* love it as, for the sake of a false peace, to wink at and apologize for sin.'

"His room was hung with several pictures from scenes in the Scriptures, executed in Italy, and were brought home by his most excellent son, Charles D. Balfour, Esq., a bright scholar who travelled extensively in Europe, and died a few years ago. His death was a great affliction, not only to his parents and brothers and sisters, but to a large social and literary circle which held him in the very highest esteem. After viewing these pictures, the good old father desired us to go—nay, he wished to accompany us himself—into the other parlor, across the front en-

try, there to inspect other paintings, and especially to see the admirably executed likeness of his departed son He asked us to assist him. He wished to walk once more, and to do so leaning on us, one of his old friends. We helped raise him from his arm chair, and supported his whole left side with our right arm, whilst he supported his right by the aid of a staff. In this way he tottered along, slowly moving one foot a few inches at a time beyond the other. We were glad to be his conductor on so long and on so interesting a journey. In due time we had emerged from his room, crossed the entry, and stood before the image of his son in the parlor. He did not know we saw the tear gather in his eye—he sought to conceal it—but that tears should flow at the remembrance of such a son, was both natural and commendable. He has yet two sons living who are able, and, we are happy to say, esteem it their highest privilege to contribute to the support and comfort of their aged and worthy parents. The daughter, too, who is with them, is sedulous and unremitting in her efforts to serve the faithful and affectionate father and mother of a dutiful and beloved family. After inspecting the paintings, and witnessing other curiosities, the return journey was commenced, and in due time accomplished; and as we replaced the patriarch in his arm chair, he exclaimed—'There, Br. Drew, this is the longest journey I have performed for a great while; perhaps it is the last I ever shall take, and you have been my supporter in it. My journey of life is almost finished, during which I have been always supported by kind friends; my final rest I trust will be glorious.'" *

Such was the feebleness of the aged saint, on the 5th of November, 1850. He sinks and dies.

*See the "Gospel Banner" of 23d Nov., 1850.

A friend, who called on him in September, 1851, described his condition in the following terms:

"He seems as cheerful and resigned as a man in his situation can be. Sickness wears upon the minds of men, as well as their bodies. Father Balfour appears bright, however, considering his weakness and long confinement. He has utterly lost the power of locomotion. Through the day he sits, and through the night he lies; but he cannot walk, or even rise from his chair or bed without help, any more than a babe. He has a faithful and affectionate wife, in good health, and sons and daughters around him; and it is the ardent wish of all to have him enjoy all the comforts of which he is capable."

The last scene was rapidly drawing near. His mind remained unclouded. On all the great events of his life he looked back with satisfaction; and he held fast the doctrines he had defended. Not the slightest doubt passed over him in regard to them. He trusted in God; he trusted in Christ; he had a hope full of immortality. When the new year dawned, it found him still alive; but very, very feeble. He lay utterly helpless. His voice had become a whisper; the heart almost refused to act. Still, however, he lingered until Saturday, January 3d, 1852, at 9 A. M., when he expired, gently as a babe falls to sleep. His funeral was attended on the following Monday, from his dwelling-

house, in the most private manner. Prayer was offered by Rev. A. A. Miner, of Boston. One of his daughters being at the time sick with the small pox, it was rendered the more desirable that only his most intimate friends should be present. But on the preceding day (Sunday) the Universalist clergy of Boston and vicinity, made honorable references to his life, services, and usefulness. It is a remarkable fact, that Prof. Stuart died on the day following that of Mr. Balfour's death. Thus the fiat of heaven seemed to connect the events of their deaths as it had those of their lives. Many of the public journals made touching allusions to the lives and deaths of both.

Character of Balfour

In sketching the character of the subject of this memoir, we feel a fear that we cannot say truly what we think of him, without being suspected of exaggeration. When we speak of a departed friend, who would never, when living, permit any person to praise him, our words should certainly be few, and fitly chosen.

He was by nature an honest man. We will not say there never was one more so; but we must say, *we never knew* a person who excelled him in this respect. He was incapable of a lie, or of

evasion. Who can call to mind an instance of the slightest prevarication or shuffling in him? So regardful was he of truth, so well defined was his character in this respect, that among all who knew him, he would have been believed in a case in which he was not liable to a mistake, against the testimony of a hundred common men. It will be seen, then, that he could not endure hypocrisy, or evasion, and more especially falsehood in any one. As surely as the metallic point draws the lightning, were hypocrisy and falsehood certain to draw from him a withering and almost annihilating rebuke. He was a truly humble man. He had a sense of injuries, but he never thought highly of himself. He could not brook dictation, or pride, or superciliousness in any one; and this was the attribute of his mind, which sometimes gave tartness and severity to his controversial writings. This appears in his replies to Rev. B. Whitman, and especially to Rev. Parsons Cooke. But, notwithstanding what we here say, he was a truly courteous man. No one would go farther to oblige another; no one respected the aged more than he; no one would more cheerfully condescend to assist the young; no one heard a tale of true sorrow more patiently; no one received

his friends, or even strangers, with more cordiality. His politeness did not waste itself in forms of speech, but it shone out like the sun on clouds, illuminating and softening the adversities of men. In the language of another, "There were few men of greater personal excellence. We never shall forget the delightful social simplicities of his nature, the genial goodness which uttered itself in every word, the cheerful quietness of his unruffled spirit. Fully Christian in feeling and faith, there was thrown over his whole character the permanent freshness of a purity the world had not soiled, and which bigotry could not blacken."*

He was a man of true Christian independence. The servant of Jesus, he knew he was, and the servant of men for Jesus' sake; but he knew, too, that he had rights, and these he never yielded. Nothing was more agreeable to him than to sit at Jesus' feet and learn; but when he had learned what is Christian truth, he had the noble independence to declare it. He kept nothing back. How the declaration of an opinion would affect his popularity, was a question he never asked. He had an unbounded and unconquerable love of truth. It could not be

*Rev. T. P. Abell, in Trumpet, vol. xxiv, p. 174.

quenched. Like a volcanic mountain, it would have utterance, even though convulsions of society were the result. Out of this love of truth, grew his reverence for the Bible, the highest of all truth. This blessed book he ever regarded as the word of God. It was to him the fountain of life; the source of divine knowledge; the moral standard, or test, by which all doctrines must be tried. All systems of philosophy, how sacred soever in the eyes of men, were secondary in his sight, compared with the Bible. His first question was, in regard to all matters of jurisprudence, ethics, or doctrine, "What saith the Scriptures?" He venerated Prof. Stuart to the last, because he had done so much to introduce proper rules of Biblical interpretation among his religious brethren.

There have been few such men as Walter Balfour. Nothing was more natural than that he should become a Universalist, after Prof. Stuart (unwittingly on his own part) had put him upon the train of inquiry. It is among men of this class, in which we may place not only Balfour, but Murray, Winchester, the early Streeters, Barnes, Ballou, and many others—all at first of the partialist faith—it is among *such* that Universalism makes its most eminent triumphs.

Concerning those who have departed this life, it is the custom to say, *they are dead.* But in what sense are they dead? Their bodies indeed are not present with us any more; but do not all men live unto God? Abraham and Isaac and Jacob were not present on the earth, in the days of Christ; but they were not dead; for God was *their* God, and he "is not the God of the dead, but of the living." In this sense men live on, after their bodies return to the dust. They survive the dissolution of their bodies also, in the influence their lives exert after they are gone. Said Daniel Webster, in his discourse on the deaths of Adams and Jefferson, "How little is there of the great and good which can die. They live in all that perpetuates the remembrance of men on earth; in the recorded proofs of their own great actions, in the offspring of their intellect, in the deep engraved lines of public gratitude, and in the respect and homage of mankind. They live in their example; and they live emphatically, and will live, in the influence which their lives and efforts, their principles and opinions exercise, and will continue to exercise, on the affairs of men." Thus Walter Balfour still lives, and will live. The effect of his studies, and of the works

Influence of the good after their death.

which he gave to the world, cannot soon pass away. As we said in the preface to this little volume, "the truth that radiated from him will be reflected from mind to mind; and many will be enlightened by it, who may not be conscious of ever having heard his name." If it be pleasant to have the likeness of a great and good man on canvass, or in marble, how much more so to have the image of his thoughts, his flaming aspirations, his zeal for God. Such is the likeness that is left to us of Walter Balfour! and while we look at him in this point of view, may his honesty, his love of truth, his noble independence, his natural kindness and benevolence—in a word, the whole man, be copied by us.

A la Mme

UCSB LIBRARY
X-58058

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
B 000 007 893 1